KA MANA UNUHI:

AN EXAMINATION OF HAWAIIAN TRANSLATION

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

ENGLISH

December 2018

By

Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada

Dissertation Committee:

Craig Howes, Chairperson
Cristina Bacchilega
kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui
Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio
S. Shankar
Noenoe K. Silva

Keywords: Translation, ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi, Hawaiian newspapers, ea, mana

ABSTRACT

Translation has had a huge impact on Hawaiian history, both as it unfolded and how it came to be understood, yet it remains mostly invisible and understudied in contemporary Hawaiian scholarship. The study of translation is uniquely suited for examining the power dynamics of languages, and how these differential forces play out on ideological and political battlefields, particularly in colonial situations. By providing a historical overview of the material practices of translation from the kingdom era until today, this dissertation makes legible some of the unseen operations of translation and points to its importance as an analytical frame for Hawaiian history. Individual chapters focus on major moments of translation from the advent of Hawaiian literacy to contemporary struggles over language and land: the translation of the Bible into Hawaiian, the establishment and modification of the kingdom's bi-lingual legal system, Hawaiians' powerful deployment of translation in the nūpepa, the twentieth century production of extractive scholarly translations, and contemporary refusals to translate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

He lau, he mano, he kini, he lehu hoʻi. There are multitudes to whom I am grateful, from all of my ancestors, to those who laid the foundation for me in this lifetime, to those who will come after. There have been so many pilina that have carried me through this process, old seeds and new growth, that I can only hope to name some of them.

I never liked school very much until I got to college and truly began to connect with my kumu, so for this genealogy of ʻike, I would like to start with them. The generosity with which they made space for haumāna like me has been breathtaking. I have learned so much from my kumu ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, my kumu ʻike Hawaiʻi, and my kumu ma ke keʻena ʻo English. Each of them has fought for me in different ways and showed me different ways to move through the world, sometimes in more Hawaiian ways, but also just in more engaged and thoughtful ways. Even when I have stepped out of their malu, e laʻa me kahi pua ʻaʻala e mohala mau ana ma ka haka ʻolu o uka, I am grateful for the foundations that they laid for me.

My committee has been both inspirational and scary throughout this entire process. They are all academic meʻe that I have looked up to ever since I knew what was what, and to have them engage so closely with my work was a humbling and exhilarating experience. Jon, you have been my role model in so many ways since I first took your classes as an undergrad. I blame you for teaching me how to think critically and question everything. I think that some of my subsequent teachers are upset at you for that as well.

Noenoe, for the span of years that we have known each other, you have always been generous with me, but also never shied away from holding me accountable and letting me know if you thought I was messing up. I am so grateful for the ʻike and manaʻo that you share with me and others through your powerful academic work, but also for the in-person paʻi when I need them.

ku‘ualoha, you’ve been there since the early days of my academic journey, and it has always been a comfort to me that someone like you has already trod this path, paving the way and making room for those of us who come after. Even with all of the work that you have done, it is exciting to think of where you might take things in the future.

Shankar, I still remember dying in your South Asian Novel class because I was so out of my depth, but also how much your translation class brought life to my work and came to inform my scholarship at a cellular level. Your insistence on precision of thought and syntax continues to challenge me to hone my writing and my thinking.

And Cristina, my school mom, how I love you so! You were involved in almost all of my academic publications, from gentle prodding to outright badgering, not to mention the actual and deep influence your scholarship has had on my work. I would not be here without you.

Craig, I once wrote a mele for you that referred to you as a kumu kukui, and that is still an image that I hold of you. You have been a beacon for me, in terms of your archival research ma nā ‘ōlelo ‘elua, but also just in the generosity that you give your students. I always tell people about the time you sat with me for eight hours straight one evening going over the translation that I did with Beau Bassett and ‘Emalani Case of *Ka Mo‘olelo o Kamehameha I*. I also tell people about how you made us walk for two hours to get to the National Portrait Gallery in Canberra because you thought the map that had the directions on it was to-scale (it wasn’t). But those two examples really are emblematic of the lengths and literal distances you will go with your haumāna to ensure that they get what they need. I can never thank you enough for what you have done for me, and I know you will just shrug it off, but mahalo. He aloha nui ko‘u nou.

Another pilina that has gotten me through so much of this process is the one between me and my ‘ohana. Though it is an oft-repeated cliché, they are a strength that is always there when I need it. I would often miss family events because I was writing, and they were always understanding because they felt that what I was doing was important. They never made me feel

like I wasn't putting enough into our pilina; I just always knew that they were there if I needed them.

My mother Gaylien taught me to read at home before she sent me off to school, and if she wasn't taking me bowling, she was taking me to the library, where according to her the librarians let me take out way more than the allowed number of books each time. I don't know if that is true, but I do know that I was always able to check out stacks of books that were up to my waist, and I know that my mother fostered my life-long love of reading, which has been the engine for all of my academic development.

My dad Ken wasn't much of a reader, but his humble and quietly confident demeanor really set the example for how I would approach not just my work, but my life in general. When I was taking a million years to finish my undergraduate degree, he pulled me on the side one day and said, "Eh, boy, no listen to the people telling you to give up and get a real job. You know what you're doing, so just do it." He also told me not to join the military like he did because I don't like to have to listen to people if I don't think they know what they are talking about. I already wasn't planning on joining the military, but I didn't realize how well that quality would serve me in academia.

I probably shouldn't mention my brother Garrett because if he's reading this, he'll have fallen asleep with the dissertation on his face by this point. But even though he and I often joke about how different we are in our relationship to school, he has always been someone whose strength, intelligence, and perseverance I have looked up to since I was young and he would beat up the people who picked on me. We've been so lucky to spend so much time together with you and Joey and the boys (I don't have a favorite nephew...okay, I might), and those are the kinds of times that helped me get through this process.

And the last of my 'ohana that I want to mention are my kūpuna. I never got to meet my grandfather on my mom's side, but my grandma Lillian Wainani Ortega is a strong presence in my self identity, as a mānaleo and as someone whose sense of justice involved spanking each

and every child who was in the area of a wrongdoing, because if they weren't the ones doing it, they should have been stopping it. I didn't get to spend as much time with her as I would have wanted, but I hold my memories of her dear.

My grandma and grandpa on my father's side were the ones that I got to spend the most time with, and they shaped this dissertation in unexpected ways. Stories fell from my grandpa Takeo Kuwada's lips almost as if he had a nervous tic that expressed itself as narrative. He would tap at the cover to a jar that he would use as a lid for his water glass (though I never knew what he thought would fall inside), and tell hilarious stories about being punished for not bowing towards the Emperor's picture or how he got into a car accident with the only other car on the island when he was on Kiritimati. He taught me that stories are a family trait, and so much of my life has come to be about moʻolelo, so for that among so many other things, I am grateful. My grandma Jeannette, who worked at our family's restaurant Ocean View Inn in Kona from the time she was 11, reads everything that I write, whether academic or creative. She gets out her dictionary, and kneels over the work, and reads. And then she often points out typos. But it is because of readers like her that I have written the dissertation the way have, hopefully accessibly and able to be read by grandmas.

Another family that has helped me through the process of writing my dissertation is my work ʻohana. The storytelling work that we do has helped me hone my thinking and analysis on so many issues affecting our lāhui. My workplace has been a fertile ground for imagination and creativity and debate in concert with my co-workers Kanaʻia, Kaipo, Kalani, Chryssa, and James (see how I didn't write Jumes, James?), and it is truly from the efforts of Kēhau and Gonzo that it is that way. Kēhau, your history of working for the lāhui and the powerful way that you live your values has always been an inspiration to me, and I would not have been able to finish this dissertation if you weren't so clearly convinced that it was something important. Gonzo, working for you has been one of the best experiences of my life. I go to work every day looking forward to what we are going to do next. Sitting in your office and dreaming all day has really broadened

my understandings of how narratives shape the future for our lāhui. Mahalo nui iā ʻoe, e kēlā mea hana keko.

The ʻohana that I am closest to in many ways, however, has been my friends. I feel like I have been reborn in many ways, maybe around a decade ago or so, and in that way, I have been raised by women. I have learned from mana wahine in ways that I never knew I was missing until I realized how much that learning had fed me. They have taught me how to love ʻāina, how to love the connections between us, how to love myself, how to love as liberation. The constant tree/bird/edna in my life has been Aiko. Always pushing me to grow my branches, my breath, my breadth, and my aloha. My last reader, my first cheerer, the one who reminds me of how tall I am. There is not enough space to write about her, and our stories have been written in bark and stone for thousands of years, so I will put my ea into my words and create more stories with her in person. Thanks, you.

Cheryl, I know we're sometimes the same person, wearing the same clothes, but I still wish you were here. Your strength, and intelligence, and fierce loyalty always made me feel sheltered, especially because I am pretty sure that I get to go to the Good Party. Chicken rice at Millipede Mansion and hours-long discussions of colonialism or translation or cooking are among my favorite memories. So come back, and bring my friends Naomi and Steven.

Noe, we've been hoa in so many ways. Hoa kākau, hoa haʻi ʻōlelo/moʻolelo, hoa kamaʻilio, hoa paio (at swimming, though I know I was never actually able to compete), and most importantly, hoa aloha. You always show me what a commitment to community should look like in my scholarship and the way I live my life. I am proud to be someone you call friend, and someone you share your aloha with. I see that aloha on display in everything you do, and it is capacious, incisive, inspirational, and inseparable from our ʻāina and our people. He koa maoli ʻoe.

Jean, it's been so long, but the effects you have had on my thinking and the way I carry myself persist. The way that you insist on joy as part of your everyday praxis reminds me of the

beauty all around us and has made me marginally less of a curmudgeon! I hope that we get to see you and Ray and Denzel soon. I get to hear a lot less laughter when you are not around.

Friend Lyz! I have your two dollars around here somewhere! Your vortex of strength, love, and sci-fi nerdery kept me going through the months of being sequestered away in my cave. Helping me be a fledgling poet has truly changed my life, in surprising and sometimes distressing ways, and I thank you for that. It is always so much fun to discuss our sci-fi visions of the future, though we both know the truth is that we mostly just want our futures to include baking bread and reading spec fic.

Anjoli, sender of videos of bears being attacked by cats, you have been such a goofy and beloved presence in my life since before this dissertation was even a twinkle in my eye. Your support through the dissertation writing process—which includes the aforementioned bear videos, coming up with weird nicknames for me, accidentally taking videos of yourself with the GoPro, sending me perfect songs for my writing/driving soundtrack, and being an all around great friend—has really been crucial and something that I deeply appreciate. As you know, I show it by being mean to you, so you can expect more of that to come because I really appreciate everything you do.

CJ, you are one of my best friends. I feel like it is so weird to say that I am honored to be your friend. It seems so formal, and I always talk about you being the Dragon Lord, but it really is a deep and profound honor to be in your life. To be in each other's lives the way we are, to be a part of each other the way we are, there is no other way to describe it than an honor, a privilege, a kuleana. Even though we are fellow murderbots, so much of our connection is of salt, through the ocean that we both love, but also through the savor that salt brings. I once read that a dragon ascended to the heavens from Ulleungdo. I wouldn't presume to know anything about what that mo'olelo means, but I will never forget the picture of you touching that ocean and somehow, that story does seem fitting. Your heart came from the sea, and your constellations came from your self. I love you, swell-singer.

No‘u, I never expected what our pilina has become. I never knew how deep down I had been asking, “I wai no‘u.” You have given me so much wai over the years. Wai, waiwai, and even waimaka. We have shared so much, especially this last handful of years, when we have become iwi for each other. You were a kuamo‘o all the times when I was down and broken and even the lighter times when I was just frustrated at what I was writing. “Shut up, I’m coming over” saved me more than you know. Sharing vulnerability and opening ourselves to each other has really helped me become more rooted in aloha. The way you love has been a sunrise for me. I feel like we have grown together during this time, leaning on each other, but also pushing each other in new directions, and I have absolutely nothing to do with this, but seeing you develop as a poet and performer to where you are now has been utterly life-changing. You have shown me your heart, e ku‘u hoa, and it is stunning.

For as long as this section has become, I still do not feel that I have been able to truly acknowledge what these mana wahine mean to me. I am going to include a poem that I wrote for them to end this section. It is still insufficient, but at least some of these images point in the direction of how much I love them and want to acknowledge their mana. And maybe it has something to do with translation as well.

I have never written a love poem in English.
This tongue’s words far too revealing, rusted consonants
and hissing sibilants issue forth, opening my mouth
too wide. In English, meaning rushes out, breathing
an imbalance of air, and I sound diphthongs for
protection. In Hawaiian, we appreciate dissembling,
vowels giving our fears armor of bird’s wings or
flower’s petals, rain coming at sunrise and
leaving at noon. We talk of love to everyone
we meet, but whisper secret hearts into
rock hollows and calabashes, life given our words
by unplain speech

So perhaps these are not my words, not my breath
speaking love in the night sky of your name, licking
salt from our friendship. Yet here are tentative
steps toward ocean, warm salt reaching, offering
ceremony and connection, saying more plainly what I
would rather hide. This is seawater in my lungs,
painful and cleansing, keeping me short of breath, yet
your words are sweet and whole as fruit, seeds falling
into furrowed ground. Unfamiliar stones in my mouth
watered by sea. I know only that each will grow
into a star

But I have never written a love poem in English, so
now I fear I have mispronounced our word for star, calling
forth fertility instead, and a sky too crowded for navigation.
My words have misread a flight of birds into a
constellation, and set my course by these stars whose
names I have not yet learned. If I say I love you, which
words have brought me here? Whose words have fallen
from my lips? Carried not on wind but by my fearful
breath. I push the stones from my mouth hoping they
fall into the creases of your palms. Hoping that
you are not burned by their heat, nor frightened by their
weight. You who have always offered me the embrace
of your friendship. The shelter of your arms. The warmth
of your words

So perhaps these are not my words, not my breath,
because they have come so much from you. I have patterned
them on barkcloth for you, alternating triangles becoming a
net, not to entangle, but to feed. And here they are, gentle
words you have grown in my mouth, stalks supple and
slender, roots reaching into my chest. Harvest them when
you wish, and plant them against famine. You who are
land and sea to me. I wish only to be a valley wall, my spine

curving along your length, buffeted by the wind. Only to
be star, fruit, stone, breath, only to speak plainly when
I tell you...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: HĪKAPALALĒ, HĪKAPALALĒ

A crowd had gathered. Light from the torches twinkled in the eyes of the men and women as they gazed ahead expectantly. Ka‘uiki lay off to the east, a quiet shadow on the horizon.

Captain Cook strode purposefully to the head of the crowd. His confident swagger put a slight swing to the malo tied around his bare waist as he entered the circle of firelight.

Cook looked out intently over the faces of those gathered before him, and drew back his strong brown shoulders proudly. The crowd gasped at his baggy skin, pocket of riches, and triangle-shaped head.

He produced a length of pohue vine and set the end on fire, taking a long drag before exhaling the smoke out over the crowd with a cough. He then shoved the vine into his malo, and pulled it back out, before drawing a deep breath.

With a grave countenance, he proclaimed in a loud voice, “A hīkapalalē, hīkapalalē, hīnolue, ‘oalaki, walawalakī, waiki poha.”

His words echoed out across the bay. The semi-circle of people around him continued to stare in wonder for a few seconds at the powerful explorer before them.

And then they collapsed in giggling and fits of laughter.

As it turns out, it wasn’t actually Captain Cook standing before them, but a man from Hawai‘i Island named Moho, who had been living on O‘ahu. He heard from the people of Kaua‘i about their experiences with Captain Cook, and rushed off to regale the ali‘i of his home island, Kalani‘ōpu‘u and his court, with tales of this new visitor. And as those of you who speak ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i know, his proclamation makes absolutely no sense—a string of nonsensical syllables that came to mean “gibberish” in later times. Well over two hundred years later, we still have no idea what the “real” Captain Cook actually said.

Translation has marked our history since our earliest interactions with outsiders,[1] and for many people, daily life in the kingdom was punctuated with instances of translation. Kanaka traders interacting with sailors from across the sea. American missionaries preaching to gathered crowds. Kuaʻāina from the countryside haggling with Chinese poi factory owners. Though ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi was the primary language for the majority of the populace during the kingdom and on into the Territory, English, French, Russian, Greek, Tahitian, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and many more languages were heard here, and especially in the ports. While English became the main foreign language competing for power in the kingdom, through a treaty in 1853, the French also tried to bring their language into parity with ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi and English (Kuykendall *Vol II* 48–50). Colonial languages vied with ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi in the same way that colonial values vied with those of Hawaiians, each trying to gain mana for their interests in Hawaiʻi.

In her analysis of the role of language in the formation of the nation-state of Malaysia, Rachel Leow says:

> The plurality of languages within a single bounded territorial polity (itself a relatively modern way of organizing space) often appears as a curse to unity: something monstrous to be tamed by the hegemony of a national language, or a standardized vernacular, or carefully wrought policies regulating how, when, and who speaks, in how many languages. (2)

For foreigners, the choice of which language had primacy in Hawaiʻi was almost always related to determining what would give them the most political and economic influence and advantage. Hawaiians were themselves political beings, fully capable of making decisions in their own best interests. But during the kingdom era, choices about which language or languages to employ under specific circumstances were shaped by their sense of what would best help bring into

[1] It is likely that there were encounters with people from other island groups, and there are moʻolelo about Spaniards shipwrecking here, though none of the interchanges between Hawaiians and these other folks seem to have been recorded.

being the world they envisioned for the lāhui. Missionaries and others insisted that English was the key to a progressive and modern society. But Hawaiians were highly aware that ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi is what connected them to the ʻāina and made them who they were; it was something of great capacity and power.

One of our most important and oft-quoted proverbs is “i ka ʻōlelo nō ke ola, i ka ʻōlelo nō ka make,” usually translated as “in language there is life and in language there is death.” The entirety of our lives and our deaths, and how we see the world, is contained in our ʻōlelo. When we look carefully at how language entwines with culture, we see that the loss of language leads to cultural death, but also that within the language is the capacity for cultural life. That is the crux of why translation is so important in Hawaiʻi. Hawaiians put such a strong cultural value on our language (like most cultures do, but in ways unlike most cultures do as well), and also because life and death are the stakes of translation here. kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui shows how much is riding on translation when she says, “Moʻolelo reflect how Kānaka Maoli imagined themselves as a lāhui” (198) where even our own self-image is at stake. Translation has affected and continues to affect the life and death of the spirit, the life and death of the ʻāina, the life and death of the lāhui, even the life and death of how we are remembered.

And yet, going even beyond Lawrence Venuti’s famous assertion of the translator’s invisibility (1995), translation itself has often been all but invisible in our understandings of Hawaiian history. Translation and post-colonial theory scholar S. Shankar points out the need and the potential for making translation more apparent:

> When critics who do not themselves translate at least acknowledge the plurality and diversity of translation practice and retune their critical attitudes in the light of such an acknowledgment, the many instances of translation begin to emerge as opportunities for a wide variety of critical intervention rather than simply as "problems" to be bemoaned. (107)

Though a powerfully illuminating return to the primacy of Hawaiian-language sources has

refuted and recast understandings of our history and culture long derived from mainly English-language sources, apart from pointing out that translations of Hawaiian have often been insufficient and had profoundly damaging effects, little academic attention has been paid to the interplay *between* these languages. There are certainly good reasons for focusing on the passage from Hawaiian to English, and noting that the results have often been bad. But as we will see in Chapter Four, if we do not expand upon that notion, the results will continue to be damaging.

Studying translation is a highly effective means for examining the power dynamics of languages, and especially how these differential forces engage with each other on ideological and political battlefields, particularly in colonial situations.[2] Because translation is itself a process of uneven transfer, with messages picked up or lost or modified along the way, this process lays bare many of the conflicts of colonial interaction. But all too often we give translation a pass, letting it remain the invisible conduit between languages. Whether for reasons of linguistic incapacity or simple convenience, treating translation as merely a mechanical process by which words from one language are substituted for their equivalents in another has been, and still is, seductive, because it allows us to proceed as if cultural values and understandings of people and concepts rooted in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi can be transmitted without complication through the medium of a completely foreign language.

Thus much of the work of this dissertation is to act as a reminder not to accept easy translation. The seduction of easy equivalency, of creating shorthands, leads to claims that two very different things are essentially the same. It lets us make comparisons too blithely. And because such assumptions about equivalency are already woven into the warp and weft of so many of our historical sources about Hawaiʻi, reproducing such naïve understandings about translation will make our own contestations of these sources less incisive and nuanced. Nor can

[2] Current scholarship makes the point that Hawaiʻi is an independent nation under military occupation, having never been a colony of another nation (Sai 2008; Beamer 2014), but as might be expected, the forces of colonialism and settler colonialism still come into play, whether Hawaiʻi was a colony or not.

we treat translation as solely about inadequacy and loss, because this allows many of the consequences of how it has operated and continues to operate in Hawai‘i to remain hidden. Within postcolonial studies, untroubled assumptions that translation is always bad have led to the term becoming a rather lazy metaphor for any process that results in transformation, or for colonization itself. Through land theft, forced adoption, oppressive education, military force, and so forth, colonizers *translated* indigenous people into colonized people. It can be argued, perhaps, that translation is an effective metaphor for getting people to recognize that at one point indigenous people were one way, but then at another point, through whatever forces were inflicted upon them, they became another. But the analogy here does little more than suggest that something changed a people, and if translation as a trope can encompass everything, and apply to every situation, such universal applicability means the analogy brings little or nothing of value to analyses. If translation can stand in for everything, it represents nothing.

The ubiquity of this understanding of translation should not be surprising, having grown for the most part out of non-translators' reliance on popular conceptions of translation as an exchange of equivalences rather than a fundamental reauthoring. This is not to condemn such scholars or the general public for making such assumptions. It wasn't until the late 1970s that translation scholars like Gideon Toury and André Lefevere began to shift the academic discussion of translation from prescriptive to descriptive studies that paid attention to the interpretive aspects of translation. Then in the late 1980s and early 1990s most of the rest of the field, greatly influenced by cultural studies, postcolonial theory, and the work of feminist translators (Tymoczko "Translation" 7), moved away from long-held preoccupations with ideas of faithfulness and literalness, and towards an engagement with matters of ideology and power. But the enduring presence of notions of equivalence and direct transfer in translation studies and in the popular understanding suggests to what degree such assumptions have generally gone unchallenged.

By studying specific examples of how translation has mediated and determined the

nature of the back and forth between English and Hawaiian from the early kingdom until today, this dissertation demonstrates that paying close attention to the material practices of translation, and making these operations visible, can bring into much starker relief the forces of racism, chauvinism, colonialism, and academic imperialism at play when these crucial moments of translation occurred. Among other contributions, such a study can give lie to easy assumptions that the victory of colonialism in the Hawaiian kingdom was always a foregone conclusion—or even a victory. Translation has never been a one-way process, but is always marked by contestation, with settler and Hawaiian mana and ea frequently teetering on translation's razor edge.

Chapter One focuses on the first major act of translation in the kingdom era: bringing the Bible into ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. Just as the first encounters with "Kapena Kuke" were shot through with translation, the introduction of alphabetic literacy in Hawaiʻi, though inseparable from Christianity by design, somewhat unexpectedly also proved to be inseparable from translation. In this case, long-held convictions about the nature of translation, reinforced by a nineteenth century colonial mindset, clashed with its actual practice as necessarily a process of interpretation and reauthoring, and paying attention to these clashes is crucial for understanding how the translation of the Bible and the production of the kingdom's bilingual system of laws actually happened, and what the major ramifications rippling out from these initiatives proved to be. Missionary accounts of the time describe the Hawaiian language as lacking; it simply does not have the vocabulary necessary to encompass Christianity and its doctrines. A close examination, however, reveals that what was really lacking was the missionaries' own skill in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. But their drive to "publish salvation," and thereby figure Hawaiians as a salvable people, leads not only to the relatively swift translation of the Bible, but also the necessary erasure, based in part on their understanding of scriptural translation, of the extensive assistance they required in the process from Hawaiians expert in their own language, many of whom remain unnamed to this day.

Both the spiritual needs of Christianity and the practical needs of the mission required that this translation would do the impossible: perfectly transfer the Bible from its original languages to Hawaiian. The resulting Hawaiian Bible had to be “Hemolele,” the Hawaiian word for “holy,” but also the word for “perfect,” and this “perfect” transfer was the massive set-piece upon which the missionaries hung all of their “civilizing” efforts. Repeatedly enacted through translation, they devoted themselves to “imposing a framework for gender and sexuality with particular consequences for anything deemed outside of a civilized form of heterosexually monogamous male dominance” (Kauanui 46%), to severely hindering the transmission of traditional Hawaiian cultural knowledge and practices, and ultimately to contributing to the displacement of kānaka from the land. But this inseparability of literacy, translation, and religion also meant that while Christian values were spreading through the lāhui, more begrudgingly in some areas than others, so too were powerful tools that Hawaiians took up immediately to increase the ea and mana of the lāhui.

Chapter Two tracks the contested flow of translation as integral to the transition from traditional kānāwai to a system of law that relied on many forms of British common law even as it modified for its own purposes the relatively new American constitutional model. Because the law is where language most affects people’s daily lives, given the kingdom’s bilingual legal and governmental system, translation was immensely important. Initially determined and authored by Hawaiians, the written ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i versions of the laws had primacy. But the model of translation employed for the Bible, with its faith in a perfect transfer into ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, began to shift as the dictates of “civilizing” efforts increasingly demanded that English, the language of the monied and landed hyper-minority, become the controlling language of law. The Hawaiian legal system’s heavy reliance on common law, rather than on civil law, led to power being concentrated in the foreign-dominated judicial branch rather than in the Hawaiian-dominated legislature. Although the translators of the Bible—one of whom actually became a translator of the law—were certain that the Bible could be translated into other languages and still be a

perfect representation of the word of God, the idea that law could only be relied upon in its "original" language (despite the fact that many of the laws had been initially written in Hawaiian) came to dominate the legal system within the few decades after the publication of the Baibala Hemolele in its entirety. Legal scholar Rubén Asensio calls this willful misunderstanding of translation "the genealogical axiom," and it not only wreaked havoc on Hawaiian connections to ʻāina, but fundamentally altered how Kānaka Maoli were figured through language.

Whereas the first two chapters are about the institutionalizing of translation, Chapter Three focuses on what happens when translation is set loose. By the 1860s, literacy in Hawaiian is widespread, and Hawaiian-language newspapers have been around for nearly three decades already. But all of these nūpepa came from the mission or government press, and while the lāhui read and greatly valued the nūpepa, many kānaka wanted content that wasn't as overtly religious and didactic, more mele and traditional moʻolelo, and a wider variety of foreign moʻolelo. Clearly, the solution was newspapers for Hawaiians written and edited by Hawaiians, but when a coalition of Hawaiians and a few haole produced the first independent Hawaiian-language newspaper, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, containing much of the content that Hawaiians had been calling for, a massive backlash followed from the missionary establishment and many of the Hawaiian churches. Translation figured prominently in the initial uproar over a mele published in *Ka Hoku*, and the practice was vital to the nūpepa throughout its run. And in the following years, as Hawaiian language newspapers proliferated and flourished, translation was one of the marks of a vibrant, intelligent, and confident people, who freely brought foreign texts into ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi to satisfy the ravenous curiosity of the Hawaiian reading public. Translated foreign moʻolelo appeared right next to traditional Hawaiian moʻolelo, and Hawaiians keenly read the translated news about far-off places. Tracing translation therefore means also tracing the emergence and development of a thriving Hawaiian-language literary print culture.

Though some of the nūpepa translators were foreigners, most were totally bilingual Hawaiians, and these translators were frequently political leaders and aloha ʻāina as well.

Certainly a tool for entertaining and delighting readers, translation also served national political purposes. In Chapter Three, I examine the ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi version of Jules Verne's *20,000 Leagues under the Sea*, paying attention to how the descriptions of Captain Nemo are translated to embody certain values of aloha ʻāina crucial to the ongoing debate over the reciprocity treaty with the United States. While the missionary descendants and their associates were doing their best to limit Hawaiian autonomy in the realms of religion, law, and politics through acts like the Bayonet Constitution, or the legal maneuverings related to translation described in Chapter Two, the nūpepa remained untamable. Despite libel suits and a lack of major advertisers enjoyed by the establishment newspapers, the nūpepa run by aloha ʻāina used everything at their disposal, including translation, to increase the mana and ea of the lāhui in the face of constant foreign depredation.

Chapter Four deals with the aftermath of the overthrow and illegal annexation to the United States. The institutional power of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi had been eroding throughout the last decades of the nineteenth century, and the rapidly increasing numbers of American immigrants, and the often rabid monolingualism they brought with them, seriously threatened the survival of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. The previously vibrant enterprise of translation into Hawaiian became a practice serving a niche market, while on the other hand, translation out of Hawaiian into English took off. The territorial period (1900–1959) was the golden era for extractive misrepresentative translations. Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau, Davida Malo, John Papa ʻĪʻī, and Kepelino were all translated during this time, as part of a shared project devoted to saving "disappearing" Hawaiian ʻike—*not* for Hawaiians but for haole scholars. In the nūpepa, translation had given ea and mana to the lāhui. These later translation projects were all about establishing the reputation of Hawaiian knowledge as an academic field of study. For this reason, these scholars and translators were often heavily invested in emphasizing the antiquity of the knowledge entombed within these translations in order to put their work on par with those who studied other "great cultures" of the world. Through text selection, inherent and pervasive bias, and editorial fiat,

these translations created a picture in English of a moribund Hawaiian culture and history whose value was merely as an academically interesting addition to universal human history. The organizations responsible for producing these translations also had vested interests in Hawaiians disappearing. Many were published through the auspices of the Anthropology department of the Bishop Museum, and many of that museum's trustees had played major roles in the overthrow and subsequent push for annexation in the face of intense opposition from the vast majority of Hawaiians, who most certainly *did not* disappear. But the fact that our mo'olelo through translation were re-presented as anthropological artifacts, similar in nature to fish hooks or feathered cloaks, contributed greatly to creating the false impression of our disappearance as a living people.

Chapter Five describes what happens when rather than disappearing through translation, Hawaiians decide to refuse translation in ways that makes us more legible. Three very recent and very public refusals to translate from 'ōlelo Hawai'i to English expose the workings of settler state institutions predicated on eliminating Hawaiians. Faye Hanohano declined to translate in the state legislature, Kaho'okahi Kanuha and Kaleikoa Kā'eo in the state courts, and the generative power of refusal these three Kānaka Maoli wielded within these very powerful arms of settler state power paradoxically opened up rather than closed down avenues of communication regarding the ea and mana of the lāhui Hawai'i. In the face of public and official perceptions of 'ōlelo Hawai'i as something that only exists to be translated, Hanohano, Kanuha, and Kā'eo made legible the ea of the lāhui by questioning the authority and legitimacy of the settler state to dictate who they are and what language they will speak. These refusals hinge on questioning the power of federal and state governments to recognize Kānaka as Kānaka, while at the same time realizing that those same governments will seek to enclose Hawaiians within settler colonial structures of elimination, in this case in the guise of mandating court interpreters for all those who wish to speak Hawaiian in court. Though indisputably an important step in renormalizing 'ōlelo Hawai'i, we must also be aware that it serves the purpose

of disappearing the potent critique of the state's power itself whenever a Hawaiian refuses to translate in court. This chapter ends with a discussion of the relation between the revitalization and renormalization of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi and the struggle over ʻāina, grounded in an understanding of how Hawaiians are forced to live in translation, understood not as a trope, but in a very real linguistic sense. Many of our fundamental understandings of ʻāina, and how we relate to each other and the world, come from ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, but often require translation for us to practice them today, or fight for our ʻāina.

A brief Epilogue provides a personal reflection on how translation could play a more liberatory role for our lāhui, as it did in the nineteenth century nūpepa, if we decide, based on an informed and detailed understanding of the practice, that it is a suitable vehicle for the moʻolelo we are trying to tell.

Note on ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi

By this point, it can probably can go without saying that I will not be italicizing Hawaiian words as if they were foreign—though I still sometimes wish they were a little more kamaʻāina to me. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own. I will not however apologize for any mistakes or mistranslations, because given the subject of this dissertation, their very presence for those who can recognize them will reinforce how much unchecked power translators have in their hands.

An interesting and innovative approach for dealing with translation has been advanced by Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio. She describes it as "rigorous paraphrase," and her reasoning is as follows:

> Recognizing these problems and dangers as a necessary consequence of translation, I will therefore practice a politics of refusal, invoking and articulating instances of aloha ʻāina in the moʻolelo and moʻokūʻauhau without succumbing to the pressure to reduce them, or their informing concept, to a supposed English

> equivalent. If successful, my method should not only allow aloha ʻāina to suffice, but to resonate accurately and fully because it escapes translation. (Osorio, Ja. 14)

The result is that Osorio leaves longer quotations in Hawaiian untranslated, but interacts with them in the body of her analysis in ways that indicate to the reader who cannot read ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi what the passage is talking about, thereby granting access while reminding readers that the ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, rather than a provided translation, is the text at issue.

While this is a strategy that I hope scholars will take up, I will be providing full translations for the vast majority of the substantial passages I cite in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. Many of the insights that inform my analysis have been shaped by my time as a Hawaiian-language translator, and this dissertation's focus requires that I display the workings of translation under discussion, and foreground the visibility of the translator, by actually doing translations. But as this introduction insists, and the body of the dissertation will constantly reinforce, translation is necessarily an interpretation, and I invite you to read each translation as such.

CHAPTER 1: IN THE BEGINNING WAS TRANSLATION: KA BAIBALA HEMOLELE AND A SALVABLE PEOPLE

The icy cold gnawed at his bare fingers. Brintnall had made sure to give him gloves, but he was not used to wearing them, and had forgotten them in his sea chest aboard the Triumph*. This was not his first time in the cold, but they had mostly been sealing in Mexico and trading in China of late, so he couldn't help but compare the numbing bite of New Haven to the warmth and humidity of Kealakekua.*

He had come to Yale because it was a center of learning, and it was where his tutor Hubbard had come from. He had seen the power of this unfamiliar 'ike during his travels and wanted the other kānaka back home to share in it as well.

Hubbard had taught him some English on the ship during the long passages from sealing grounds to trading ports, but he wanted more, knew he could do more. He had spent many shifts in his hammock on the berth deck dreaming of what Hawai'i might be like once learning like this was more widespread.

He wasn't familiar with New Haven, though, and it had taken him so long to get here from the harbor. He probably shouldn't have wandered on the green, but it was good to connect with 'āina, any 'āina, after so long on the ship.

The grounds of Yale were mostly empty. He shuddered, willing himself to remain calm. His hands were so cold.

He had come so far from home, and he missed the connections of family. His parents and brother were dead, but his desire for the comfort and pilina of his other relatives remained. For them that he would bring back salvation.

He had been standing before the steps of the imposing red brick building for the last fifteen minutes, and finally fell to his knees. The shuttered windows looked down impassively. Snow continued to fall, new flakes melting where they mingled with the tears sliding down his cheeks.

"Nobody gives me learning."

Publishing Salvation

A widespread, though perhaps apocryphal, tale relates how a dusky lad from the Sandwich Islands was found weeping upon the steps of Yale College on a crisp and wintry New Haven evening in 1809 (Schiff). When asked why he cried, he replied that it was because no one had given him learning. Though he had already begun to learn the rudiments of English and Christianity from Captain Brintnall while serving on a trading journey to America (Dwight 13), this moment would come to mark the true beginning of his formal education in Christianity and the literacy that came with it. No one could have known that this earnest young Hawaiian would be the catalyst for monumental change in the culture and future of his home.

His name was Heneri ʻŌpūkahaʻia, though much of America[3] came to know him as Henry Obookiah. He became a dedicated professor of religion, a skilled amateur linguist, a translator, and the direct impetus for the first company of Calvinist missionaries to travel to Hawaiʻi. ʻŌpūkahaʻia lived with and learned from various pious families in the New England area, and by all accounts, he was driven by a desire to spread the gospel, particularly to his own people in Hawaiʻi. Though no copies are thought to exist, ʻŌpūkahaʻia is said to have been close to completing a grammar, a dictionary, and a spelling book for the Hawaiian language (Dwight 43–44, 100). He also taught himself Hebrew, and translated portions of the Bible into Hawaiian (ABCFM *Narrative* 11), including the entire Book of Genesis (Schütz *Voices* 36). He reportedly found translating from Hebrew easier than from English, because of similarities in structure (Dwight 101).

Though these translations never reached the people he was preparing them for, ʻŌpūkahaʻia's serious nature, deeply rooted Christianity, dedication to learning, and good humor

[3] It should be remembered, however, that at this time the United States was made up of less than twenty states at this point, with the majority ranging along the East Coast.

served as an example to would-be missionaries and their American supporters around the country that the heathen was indeed redeemable, salvable through education in literacy and the Gospel. Before he died, ʻŌpūkahaʻia and a handful of other Hawaiians—Thomas Hopu, George Kaumualiʻi, William Kanui, and John Honoliʻi—made many speaking appearances in various states, and were instrumental in securing funding and support for a Hawaiʻi mission and for the Foreign Mission School in Cornwall, Connecticut, where they were among its first students (Kamakau *Kumu* 244).[4] At the mission school, pupils from places such as Hawaiʻi, the Society Islands, Timor, Portugal, Greece, China, and Native American nations (Seneca, Iroquois, Delaware, and others) (ABCFM *1823 Report* 133) were trained to spread the word to their own peoples, and also to help "prepare the American missionaries by teaching them about the different languages and cultures they would encounter in their future missions to foreign parts" (Schütz *Voices* 87).

In February of 1817, eight years to the month from his fateful arrival in Connecticut, ʻŌpūkahaʻia died of typhus at the age of twenty six. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) had had high hopes for him as part of the mission to Hawaiʻi. As the living embodiment of salvation through God and literacy, he was proof that the savage could find redemption. In its annual report, the ABCFM wrote of ʻŌpūkahaʻia that "he died as the Christian would wish to die. His divine master knew well, whether to send him back to Owhyhee, to publish salvation to his perishing countrymen, or to call him to higher scenes, in another world" (*1818 Report* 200). And though ʻŌpūkahaʻia ended up being called to "higher scenes, in another world," the ABCFM was inspired by his example and decided to pursue the other option: "publish[ing] salvation to his perishing countrymen."

[4] John Ridge and Elias Boudinot, who played such prominent roles in the forced removal of the Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears, were also students at Cornwall.

A reference to Isaiah 52:7, this goal was taken quite literally by the ABCFM as part of its mission to bring the Gospel to the people of Hawai‘i. In 1817, members of the ABCFM had this to say about publishing salvation:

> The translation and dispersion of the Scriptures, and schools for the instruction of the young, are parts, and necessary parts, of the great design. But it must never be forgotten, or overlooked, that the command is, to "*preach the Gospel to every creature,*" and that the *preaching* of the word, however foolish it may seem to men, is the grand mean appointed by the wisdom of God for the saving conversion of the nations. [emphasis in original] (*1817 Report* 163)

Preaching the Gospel to the far reaches of the world was "the grand mean," but translation and education were "necessary parts," and with these came publication—what Hawaiians would come to call palapala, because of the way words were pala, or daubed/smeared/designed/ printed, on paper. Palapala is also related to the word kāpala, which refers to how designs were stamped on kapa, or barkcloth ("No ka Olelo"). The ABCFM's own by-laws linked salvation, literacy, and the press: "The object of the Board is, to propagate the gospel among unevangelized nations and communities, by means of preachers, catechists, schoolmasters, and the press" (ABCFM *Instructions* 8). Above all, publishing salvation meant publishing the Bible, "the very voice of God" for without the Scriptures to guide Hawaiians, "their manifestation of Christianity was sure to go astray" (Lyons, J. 115). The Hawai‘i missionary Artemas Bishop asserted that "not only is the Bible the ultimate authority of Protestant belief, but the religion of Protestants cannot flourish where the Scriptures are not dispersed and read in the vulgar tongue" (74). But as the missionaries soon found out, despite their initial plans to use English to bring education and salvation to the Hawaiians, bestowing the Bible could not be accomplished without translation. Religion, literacy, and education would become the drivers of enormous changes in the culture, education, and politics of Hawai‘i and Hawaiians over the next two centuries, and translation was the engine that drove everything forward.

Translating Salvation

At first, the ABCFM did not know how much of a role translation would have to play in its Hawai‘i mission. The ABCFM was the United States' first organization dedicated to foreign missions, and quite a young one at that. Founded in 1810, only nine years before the Sandwich Islands Mission was launched, the ABCFM was barely older than its home church, Park Street Church in Boston. Chartered in 1809, the church would become a strong abolitionist center.

Despite its youth, the ABCFM soon became one of the largest benevolent societies in the United States. By 1825, it ranked second only to the American Education Society, and by 1831, critics were warning that the amount of money that the ABCFM was removing from circulation in the United States by its massive spending abroad on its foreign missions would destabilize the American economy (Shenk 4). Made up of Presbyterian, Reformed Dutch, and Congregational churches (ABCFM *1825 Report* 21), the ABCFM owed its formation and foundational theology to the eighteenth-century revival known as the Great Awakening (Osorio, Jo. *Dismembering* 21). The national westward expansion that justified occupation and colonialism by appeals to manifest destiny and American exceptionalism meant that the mission always had its eyes on the horizon, looking for new lands and peoples to save. The ABCFM would come to have a wide reach, sending missionaries to India, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), Palestine, Choctaw country, Cherokee country, China, Thailand, Singapore, western and southern Africa, Hawai‘i, and other sites. But thanks in part to ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia, Hawai‘i was among the first "unevangelized nations and communities" that the ABCFM's desire to bring the Gospel settled upon. As one of few remaining major island groups in the Pacific that had not yet been missionized by groups from other denominations or countries, it was a fertile field for planting and publishing salvation.

Encouraged and justified by ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia's fervent desire that the Bible be brought to his people, the ABCFM also saw the Sandwich Islands mission as a means to stake a spiritual

claim for itself as a missionary organization, and to a certain extent, for American interests.[5] Hawai‘i was an important port, both strategically and commercially, and between 1786 and 1820, more than a hundred ships had called there (Schütz *Voices* 10). This influx of what the missionaries saw as dubious characters of loose morals preying on the ignorant and godless Hawaiians also spurred the ABCFM to establish a foothold in the islands quickly.

After a handful of years of fundraising and preparation aided by ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia and the other Hawaiian youths, the first mission to Hawai‘i—made up of “ordained ministers of the Gospel, physicians, teachers, secular agents, printers, a bookbinder, and a farmer” (Hawaiian Mission 3) and the four Hawaiian youths[6]—set out from Boston on October 23, 1819, aboard the brig *Thaddeus.* After a 160 day voyage to Hawai‘i, they anchored in Kawaihae on March 30, 1820 (Kamakau *Kumu* 244). The missionaries arrived immediately after the Hawaiian traditional religion suffered a tremendous blow following the death of Kamehameha I. The kapu system that organized much of Hawaiian life had been struck down when Liholiho, his father’s successor, performed the pale lau‘ī after defeating the pro-kapu forces of his cousin Kekuaokalani (Kamakau *Kumu* 216). Predictably, when the missionaries learned this, they concluded that the hand of Providence had paved the way for Christianity in Hawai‘i.

What they actually found upon their arrival in Hawai‘i, however, was a lukewarm reception. The chiefs were not so quickly convinced that the missionaries should be welcomed, much less allowed to stay. But at the urging of John Young, a foreign-born aikāne[7] and advisor of Kamehameha I, the council of chiefs allowed the missionaries a one-year probationary period (Kamakau *Kumu* 245). Though the ali‘i let them settle, Hawaiian suspicions lingered. The mō‘ī

---

[5] The 1833 Mission Report explicitly addresses the idea of transforming Hawai‘i into an American colony. The mission’s stance was that it should provide as much information as possible about soil quality and general climate to assist people who want to come to Hawai‘i to civilize it. The mission also felt that, if asked, they would advise the chiefs about the kinds of people who would make desirable immigrants.

[6] The nineteenth-century Hawaiian historian Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau lists a fifth Hawaiian who sailed with the first missionaries, a Pā‘ulali‘ili‘i.

[7] Aikāne refers to a traditional role that implied a very close same-sex relationship of mutual intimacy, love, and trust. Though oftentimes these relationships were sexual, this was not usually the defining aspect of the aikāne pilina.

Liholiho himself, also known as Kamehameha II, was skeptical from the first. When he asked that his name be written, after the missionary wrote it “Li-ho-li-ho,” the mōʻī gave the writing a good long look and declared, “This does not look like me, nor any other man” (Judd 53). He also famously shrugged off missionary attempts to convert him:

> A i kona noho ana ma Puuloa i Oahu, hele aku kekahi misionari, o Binamu ka inoa, e hoohuli ia ia ma ka pono, e malama i ke Akua i pomaikai ai oia ma kona aupuni a i ola hoi kona uhane. Olelo mai oia me ka hoohiki pono ole, i mai la: "Elima o'u makahiki i koe, alaila, huli au i kanaka maikai.” (*Mooolelo* 93–94)
>
> [‘And when he was staying at Puʻuloa, on Oʻahu, a missionary named Bingham approached him, to try to turn him to the side of righteousness, to worship God in order that Liholiho’s government be blessed and his soul be saved. Liholiho responded with a faithless promise, saying: “Five more years, then I will become a good man.”’]

Though Bingham and the other missionaries did not end up giving Liholiho the break that he asked for, the mōʻī relented regarding the issue of literacy, sending John Papa ʻĪʻī and Kahuhu to learn from Asa Thurston, and saying that if it did them no harm, he too would learn the palapala (Judd 53).

Historian David Chang astutely notes that while the missionaries indisputably brought widespread alphabetic literacy, some Hawaiians were already aware from their interactions with other foreigners of the potential value of the written word, displaying an “appreciation of the uses of textuality [that] preceded missionization” (238). In that way, Christianity was not necessarily something the aliʻi could see the utility of at first glance—Hiram Bingham was disgusted when those learning literacy from the missionaries “demanded what temporal advantage could be derived from listening to preaching” (*Residence* 209)—as John Charlot suggests, the palapala and alphabetic literacy could “easily be appreciated as an aid in memorizing, a recognized and prestigious activity in classical Hawaiian education” (43).

ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui further characterizes the palapala as “another site of cultural memory, a vehicle to record and transport Kanaka Maoli values to future generations of the lāhui” (201).

For very different reasons, other foreigners were suspicious about the mission, and the teaching of literacy. The British sea captain who brought the news of Liholiho’s death in England also gave the ali‘i a dire warning about the missionaries and the learning they offered:

> One of the chiefs went on board to receive the letters, but the captain would not deliver them, lest they should fall into the hands of the missionaries. The chief inquired, what would be the harm, if they should. The captain replied: ‘The missionaries are bad men. They have come here to deceive you. They have come here to get your land away. If you learn the *palapala*, (i.e. if you attend to instruction) you will die.’ On being asked why learning did not kill Englishmen, the captain answered, that it was very good for white men, but it killed black men. (*1826 Annual Report* 77-78)

Though it is unlikely that kānaka maoli or ali‘i thought the palapala would literally kill them, such warnings about the colonial desires undergirding the missionary arm of the church could only fuel ali‘i skepticism of the missionaries as gateways to literacy.

Recognizing that the Hawaiian wish for literacy was accompanied by ambivalence about the new religion, the missionaries insured that the palapala could not be gotten without the pule, or prayer. In 1824, even before the Hawaiian alphabet was formalized, Levi Chamberlain gave an account of a young Hawaiian man who was castigated by another Hawaiian for being a “kanaka palapala”—something along the lines of “document man” or “literacy man” (“Journal” 39). It is telling that the man was being insulted for his connection to the palapala (writing/literacy/Western education) that the missionaries brought, rather than the pule (religion/prayers). As longtime scholar of Hawaiian religion John Charlot explains,

> *palapala*—rather than some other word, such as *pule* ‘prayer’ or *lāʻau* ‘medicine,’ both emphasized by the missionaries—was used as a pars-pro-toto term for the missionary effort argues for its being the most impressive offering of the missionaries in the Hawaiians’ view. (45)

For the Calvinist ABCFM, literacy and their model of Christianity were inseparable, because the way to heaven was through reading and interpreting the Scriptures as an individual, free from the corruption that festers in a bureaucratic clergy and corporatic church. In his influential *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* John Calvin himself wrote that “Herein God deigns to confer a singular privilege on his elect, whom he distinguishes from the rest of mankind. For what is the beginning of true learning but a prompt alacrity to hear the voice of God?” (86). With similar beliefs in mind, the ABCFM spent nearly as much for the printing press and apparatus for the first mission as for furniture, clothing, and mechanical and agricultural implements combined (*1820 Report* 308).

Calvin’s insistence on “prompt alacrity” also answered the question of who would learn whose language. Because the missionaries clearly felt that they had the most to teach the heathens in Hawaiʻi and other savage places, they initially assumed that teaching these Native peoples English first would be the fastest way of granting them access to the word of God as presented in the Bible. Although the Bible itself had been translated from Hebrew and Greek to English, teaching English would also allow the heathen to benefit from the wealth of already existing printed texts on Christianity and other “enlightening” topics. Such logic informed the 1816 mission report, which sets out the goal in regards to Native American education as

> the instruction of the rising generation in common school learning, in the useful arts of life, and in Christianity, so as gradually, with the divine blessing to make the whole tribe English in their language, civilized in their habits, and Christian in their religion. . . . Assimilated in language, they will more readily become

> assimilated in habits and manners to their white neighbors; intercourse will be easy and the advantages to them incalculable (135)

These ideas—and particularly the connections between Christianity, civilization, and literacy—were echoed a few years later, when the first mission gathered at the Park Street Church in Boston the week before setting out for the Sandwich Islands. But the perspective on language and translation already seems to be shifting somewhat, likely due to the slow progress the missionaries were making in Choctaw and Cherokee country in their efforts at spreading English (*Annual Report 1826* 63).

The "preachers, catechists, schoolmasters, and the press" were the ABCFM's blueprint for salvation, all represented in the Sandwich Islands mission. The preacher would work with the catechist and the schoolmaster to spread the gospel, with the press as their principal avenue for spreading the cause of Christianity, and the ABCFM, in Hawai'i. A simple, even elegant plan. But no one had thought to include translators on that list, as essential allies for the preachers, and catechists, and schoolmasters, and this lack soon came to be a huge issue for these young missionaries. Though the Hawaiian students from the Foreign Mission School would assist in some ways with translating, with Thomas Hopu in particular acting as an intermediary (Lyon 131), had the missionaries known how important a role translation would necessarily play in the coming years, they would have anticipated how woefully meager their own linguistic resources would prove to be.

Incorporated as a mission church, the first company received their instructions from Rev. Samuel Worcester and Jeremiah Evarts, which included the following:

> You are to aim at nothing short of covering those islands with fruitful fields and pleasant dwellings, and schools and churches; of raising up the whole people to an elevated state of Christian civilization; of bringing, or preparting the means of bringing, thousands and millions of the present and succeeding generations to the mansions of eternal blessedness. [. . .]

> But it is an arduous enterprise, a great and difficult work. To obtain an adequate knowledge of the language of the people; to make them acquainted with letters; to give them the Bible with skill to read it; to turn them from their barbarous courses and habits; to introduce, and get into extended operation and influence among them, the arts and institutions and usages of civilized life and society; above all, to convert them from their idolatries and superstitions and vices, to the living and redeeming God. (27)

Hiram Bingham later recalled also being directed "to give [the Hawaiians] the Bible in their own tongue, with the ability to read it for themselves" (60). Even though literacy was only beginning to become widespread in the twenty-two United States of the time, the ABCFM were convinced that reading was the surest way to reach Hawaiians, and thought that the "preachers, catechists, schoolmasters, and the press" they were sending would be enough to promptly accomplish this goal.

Yet the ABCFM's zeal for expediency and alacrity in spreading the gospel forced them to teach literacy in Hawaiian, making the translators missing from that equation the only viable gateway to both publishing and salvation. Though largely unprepared for the tasks of translation that lay ahead of them, the philosophy informing the ABCFM's attempts to educate and enlighten Hawaiians, conditioned by their religious principles and their experiences with missions to other indigenous nations, made a reliance on translation inevitable. As Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio argues, "The mediator for Calvinists was the Bible. The ability to read, understand, and interpret scripture and gospel was the key" (*Dismembering* 21). But English was not widespread in most of the "heathen" nations that the ABCFM targeted for conversion, and in many cases, neither was alphabetic literacy. In practice, then, "the preaching of the gospel, the establishment of schools, and all the means of imparting religious knowledge" (ABCFM *Instructions* 37) could only take place through translation.

Along with teaching Hawaiians about the words of the Apostles, the missionaries also pushed them to build American-style frame homes with glass windows and to wear Mother Hubbard dresses and wool suits. The people did not quickly accept these exhortations—Princess Ruth Keʻelikōlani famously lived in a grass-thatched hut that was situated on the lawn next to Hulihe‘e Palace. Hawaiians came to value alphabetic literacy very quickly, though it took time for the Hawaiian alphabet to be formalized and a writing system developed for the language. Even before the alphabet was finalized, however, the mission began its efforts to educate Hawaiians. Furthermore, the ABCFM focus on expediency meant that the missionaries immediately began their attempts to learn the language, so that they could carry out their primary obligation: teaching Hawaiians the Gospel.

This was a necessary departure from what the ABCFM initially anticipated, and in fact discouraged. Alphabetic literacy in English was seen as the greatest gift that could be offered:

> Were the Bible now translated into all the languages of the Indian tribes, it would be of no more use to them than our English Bible; for they could read it no better. They might be taught to read the Bible in the English language with as much ease, as they could be taught to read it in their own; and having learned to read the English language, the sources of knowledge and means of general improvement to them will be incomparably greater and more various than their own language could ever procure for them. (*Annual Report 1816* 135-36)

Since many communities and indigenous nations had no written language recognized by the missionaries, the ABCFM thought it most expedient to skip any efforts to achieve literacy in the language of the people. But problems arose quickly. Even before the arrival of the ABCFM missionaries in Hawai‘i, a Frenchman named Jean Rives had attempted to start a small school to teach English to the ali‘i, but by most accounts it failed miserably, lasting only a few weeks (‘Ī‘ī 14 Aug1869). As for the ABCFM’s early efforts in Hawai‘i and in Indian Country, the missionaries on the ground realized pretty quickly that while English could still be the goal, it

could not be the starting point. According to an 1826 ABCFM report: “From what is now taking place in the Cherokee and Choctaw nations, it is evident that the readiest way to teach an Indian child the English language is to make him able to read and write his own” (63).

Although ʻŌpūkahaʻia and the foreign mission school students such as Hopu and Kaumualiʻi did what they could to teach Hawaiian to the missionaries before setting out for the islands, teaching your own language through a language not your own is a difficult proposition at best, and George Kaumualiʻi had been away from Hawaiʻi so long that he himself had difficulty speaking his own language. The missionaries therefore arrived with nothing more than a rudimentary knowledge of Hawaiian, making their first educational priority educating *themselves* in the language of the people they wished to save.

Later accounts of the mission’s work paint a rather rosy picture of the missionaries’ language aptitude and eventual facility. The historian William Drake Westervelt’s assessment is typical: “all the members of the mission studied as diligently as they taught, and with surprising rapidity learned the pronunciation and the meaning of Hawaiian words and reduced the language to writing” (18). The truth, however, is that foreigners had been in Hawaiʻi for at least four decades by that point, and no proven, regularized system of language learning for foreigners was in place, and the missionaries struggled. Missionary journals and other accounts of the day narrate the progress and challenges of missionary language-learning, and it was slow. More than three years after arriving, Levi Chamberlain, the secular agent of the first mission, wrote in his journal that:

> The members of the mission present at this time at this station, are attending to the language of the country with a good degree of application. By the request of Mr. Bingham they are making attempts at composition. I presented this evening my first assay at writing the language.

If it took this long for them to even attempt writing, it can be imagined that language acquisition was a struggle. Granted, as the agent and quartermaster for the mission, Chamberlain was

perhaps not out among the people as much. But even Hiram Bingham, the mission's leader and minister on Oʻahu, had only advanced far enough after two years to preach brief petitions and statements of praise and adoration, and in May 1824, Stephen Reynolds, an American trader living in Hawaiʻi, recorded in his journal that a native woman Pualanui, or Puolanui, told him that "Mr Ellis & Mr Bingham spoke so that she could not understand more than half they said" (Reynolds 31).

This difficulty in learning Hawaiian did not lessen appreciably as the years passed. In 1831, five years into the translation of the Bible, the ABCFM missionaries reported that even after many years among the people most of them still lacked the skills of a translator (*1831 Meeting Minutes* 164-65). A few years later, Lorrin Andrews, generally regarded one of the most adept missionary speakers and translators of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, argued that the mission needed people who would focus on language and translation (Charlot 614–15). Amos Starr Cooke, who arrived with the eighth company in 1837 and eventually was responsible for educating aliʻi children at the Hawaiian Chiefs' Children's School, often wrote about his difficulties in learning the language. A journal entry for June 25, 1837, a little over two months after his arrival, records that he went to visit the Sabbath school, but "did not comprehend a single sentence," taking this "for a token that I ought to have staid [sic] at home or that I ought to return" (Cooke 25 June 1837). His frustration is palpable, and as anyone who has tried to learn a new language can attest, highly understandable. But on July 17, 1837, Cooke provides a far less sympathetic explanation for his inability: "Have just read a letter from bro. Bailey. He appears to have his soul interested in this people. O that mine were! O Lord why am I so indifferent to the welfare of the souls of these dying heathen. It may be that I do not get this language any faster because I care nothing about them.[8] God knows."

[8] As he would come to take charge of the English-medium Chiefs' Children's School only two years later, we can hope that this indifference lessened at some point because he and his wife were educating and caring for the aliʻi children who became the leaders of the Hawaiian kingdom, including six who served as

Cooke's lack of sympathy for "these dying heathen" and their language speaks to the powerful connection between language and culture. As one of the deep structures that gives a culture its shape and meaning, language is an important repository of values and mores. One of our most repeated proverbs is "i ka ʻōlelo nō ke ola, i ka ʻōlelo nō ka make," often translated as "in language there is life, in language there is death." This ʻōlelo noʻeau not only refers to the fact that Hawaiians have language-based healing arts like lāʻau kāhea and more lethal arts like pule ʻanāʻanā, but also that everything in the realms of life and death, that is to say everything, is rooted in our ʻōlelo. Cooke's comments certainly suggest that one of the barriers to the missionaries' language acquisition was their distaste for, or even fear of, Hawaiian culture. They were, in short, faced with what indigenous and/or colonized peoples have confronted for generations. To learn Hawaiian was to open themselves up to our world, our life and death. And this they did not wish to do. Though linguistic difficulties undoubtedly slowed the translation process, and the promotion of literacy generally, this reluctance to open themselves up to the "heathenism" embedded in the language of those they were trying to save came into play as well.

---

king or queen. As for his language abilities, Hiram Bingham was still rejecting his translations of religious tracts in 1839 (Cooke Nov 6).

Liliʻuokalani, the last reigning monarch of the Hawaiian Islands, had this to say about her school experience:

> our instructors were especially particular to teach us the proper use of the English language; but when I recall the instances in which we were sent hungry to bed, it seems to me that they failed to remember that we were growing children. A thick slice of bread covered with molasses was usually the sole article of our supper, and we were sometimes ingenious, if not over honest, in our search for food: if we could beg something of the cook it was the easier way; but if not, anything eatable left within our reach was surely confiscated. As a last resort, we were not above searching the gardens for any esculent root or leaf, which (having inherited the art of igniting a fire from the friction of sticks), we could cook and consume without the knowledge of our preceptors. (5)

While this passage shows the ingenuity of the chiefly children in procuring food, it is also mind-boggling that the future leaders of the Hawaiian nation would be treated in this fashion, forced to beg for meals or root in the garden for things to eat. This is a clear example of the mindset that went into the education of generations of Hawaiians; soon after the Royal School was opened, a law was enacted in 1840 that established a government-funded national system of common schools (Kuykendall *Vol. I* 112).

And yet, while struggling to find their way in the language at the same time as trying to avoid its cultural content, the missionaries were also constructing a working model for education and translation. At first, they followed the linguistic examples of earlier explorers and visitors, who tried to represent the Hawaiian language in writing through "imitation and invention" (Walch 356). This changed in January of 1822, however, when the mission received copies of the *New Zealand Grammar and Vocabulary*, by Thomas Kendall (*Missionary Herald* 42). The shared traits between Maori and Hawaiian observable in the grammar confirmed some of what the ABCFM missionaries had already done, and would inform some of the later decisions made for the sake of uniformity. A week after receiving this text, the first Hawaiian-language imprint came off the missionary press. The printing was a bit of an occasion, as the chief Keʻeaumoku, whom the foreigners called "Governor Cox," was taught the rudiments of operating the press and struck off the first pages (Westervelt 18). Entitled *The Alphabet*, the imprint was used to teach Hawaiians reading and spelling (Schütz *Voices* 162).[9]

Though ostensibly produced to teach Hawaiians how to read their own language, most of the explanations for pronunciation and spelling in *The Alphabet* were written in English. In contrast, *Te Aebi no Taheiti* (The Tahitian Alphabet) the first printing in Tahitian a decade earlier, only included English in the colophon (Schütz *Voices* 164). (The London Missionary Society rather than the ABCFM published this text.) In addition, despite the title, *The Alphabet* was published four years before the Hawaiian alphabet was formalized. So consonants such as b, d, r, t, and y, which soon disappeared from the Hawaiian alphabet appeared in *The Alphabet*, and Hawaiʻi is spelled "Owhy."

While Hawaiians were supposedly being taught the rudiments of literacy in their own language, Christianity was also a building block of that education. "First exercise in reading," Table IV in *The Alphabet*, featured the following sentences:

[9] The mission printer Elisha Loomis printed the first 8 pages of the book in January, and the second 8 pages in February, with an initial run of 500 copies (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 3).

E hele mai oe.

E noho marie oe i loko o ka hale.

E hana pono, a ore hana heva iti.

E hoo lohe i ka mea a ko kumu i i mai la. (*Alphabet* 3)

['You come.

You stay peacefully in the house.

Act righteously; do not sin even slightly.

Listen to what your teacher has said.']

Along with exercises such as these, where Hawaiians were instructed to listen to missionary directions and accept castigation for sin, other tables presented Jesus's stature as hiapo, or first-born—an important indicator of his stature for the genealogy-conscious ali'i—and directed readers to proseletyze on all of the islands (*Alphabet* 16). In 1825, the book was expanded and reprinted as *Ka Be-a-ba*, so named for the exercise of pronouncing "b" and then "a" aloud before joining them to pronounce the syllable "ba." The new volume had a print run of 10,000 copies, and the missionaries justified the expansion by observing that "The last one was found to be far too limited and we desired to add as much evangelical matter as possible to the little that has been before printed and in the hands of some thousands of people" (Mission Journal, 8 Apr 1825).

Like this speller, nearly everything that came from the early mission press reflected a strong religious character. First came a small hymn-book with 47 translated hymns; then *Pooolelo*, a four-page scriptural tract; followed by the *Ui*, an eight-page catechism; the "Thoughts of the Chiefs," and in 1825, the Ten Commandments (Andrews "Essay" 156).[10]

[10] So exclusively and relentlessly religious were these publications that in a letter dated Oct 6 1833, even missionary Alonzo Chapin, who produced maps and woodcuts for some of these publications, wrote to Rufus Anderson, corresponding secretary at the ABCFM, that "We need something to interest, something that will be a greater variety or we cannot keep up the schools. I think more would be accomplished for the present good of the people by preparing a good school book than by translating the Scriptures."

Important publications in their own right, they were however also preparing the way for the missionaries' defining translation and publication: the Bible.

"Perfect" Salvation

Producing the Bible ma ka ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi was a colossal undertaking. The largest single volume ever printed in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, its first edition came in at a doorstopping 2,300 pages (Lyon 113). Beginning in 1823,[11] the same year that Kauikeaouli decreed the kingdom would observe the Christian sabbath (Judd 54), the entire translation took sixteen years. Because of its central role in Protestant belief, this volume also had to be what translation scholars of today know is impossible, but missionaries trying to establish a foothold in Hawaiʻi in the early decades of the nineteenth century had to assert: one that was "perfect."

From a practical standpoint, perfection proved difficult. Due to the massive source text they were working from, many members of the mission were enlisted to try their hand at translation, but only a few proved skilled enough to create translations that could even be considered merely usable. And even then, the overall translation ultimately had to be collaborative and created by committee, for as Bible scholar Kapali Lyon points out, though missionaries such as William Richards might sit for hours each day with the kākāʻōlelo—the advisors, counselors, and learned ones—of the court, working on their language abilities, "none, even after years in Hawaiʻi, was in a position to translate 2,300 pages of ancient Hebrew and Greek into a Hawaiian that was lucid, forceful, and appealing to *Kānaka*" (116). Looking back upon that time, Hiram Bingham recalls that "no foreigner or native, at the islands, could illustrate or explain the peculiarities and intricacies of the language" (153), and while I suspect that more than a few Hawaiians were highly familiar with the "intricacies" of their own language, it is true that the haole had limited access and very few reference tools for making sense of ʻōlelo

[11] Some sources such as Lyon (117) give 1826 as the start date; this likely refers to when the more formal and organized process of translating the Bible began.

Hawai‘i. Indeed, nine years into the translation of the Bible, Lorrin Andrews, a missionary rightly celebrated for his language ability, wrote that “Even after a residence of above four years among the people and writing and preaching a great many sermons, I am puzzled every day for want of words and terms to communicate ideas to my scholars” (13 June 1852: 50f).

Binamu, Tatina, Rikeke, and Bihopa (or Bingham, Thurston, Richards, and Bishop) were the first four missionaries chosen by the board to translate and to serve as facilitators for the collaborative production process (“No ka unuhi” 57). Sheldon Dibble, Johnathan Green, Ephraim Clark, and Lorrin Andrews later joined the effort. Years later, an 1857 account in the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ka Hae Hawaii* described the procedure this way. The four missionaries, along with Kuakini and Kēlou Kamakau, had an initial meeting in Kailua, Kona, to discuss the translation strategies and framing. Each returning to his separate charge:

> I ka wa e hana ana lakou, ua koho ka mea unuhi i kanaka akamai ma ka olelo Hawaii, e kokua mai, i pololei ka olelo. Haawi no ke kumu i ka manao, e like me ke ano o ka olelo a ke Akua, me ka pahemahema nae o na hua Hawaii, a loaa pono i ke kokua, ke ano o ka manao, alaila, lawe kela i keia manao, a hoonohonoho i na hua me ka pololei iloko o ka olelo maoli. A paaia i ke kakauia ma ka pepa, alaila, komo aku ma ka pauku hou, a pela no ka hana ana ia pauku ae, ia pauku ae. (“No ka unuhi,” 57)
>
> [‘When they would work, the translator would choose an expert in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i to assist so that the language would be correct. The kumu would give the idea, pertaining to the meaning of the word of God, in halting Hawaiian, and would then get clarification, an interpretation of the idea, then they would take this and arrange the words accurately with correct language. When it was set, it would be written down, and then they would move on to the next section, and continue on in that fashion for each and every paragraph.’]

Once the assigned book was finished, it was sent to the rest of the translation committee for comparison and critique (*1827 Annual Report* 93), and then returned to the missionary translator, who would incorporate the feedback, and transcribe the new version. It was then supposedly ready for printing, though some sections had to be translated multiple times (Lyon 120).[12]

Each missionary developed his own working methods, relying on as many helpful texts as possible. Bingham began his work on the Gospel of Matthew in 1824 by comparing the Latin, English, and Tahitian versions with the original Greek to shape his Hawaiian translation (Ballou and Carter 16). Richards also labored to glean more meaning from the Scripture: "in the morning he took Knapp's Testament, Schleusner's Lexicon, and a few other helps, and strictly examined the passage which he designed to translate" (*1826 Annual Report* 77). Bishop consulted many texts as well to elucidate the meaning of the sacred text, commenting that "the labors of Rosenmuller, Kenoel, Michaels, Gesenius, Knapp, Griesback, Bloomfield, Doddrigo, Stuart, Robinson, MacKnight, Campbell and others have all contributed to aid us" (74). At times, they even asked for advice from New England philologists, which took five months or more to reach them (Schütz "Reading" 4).

---

[12] Though the story of this work often operates at the personal level, describing the missionary hammering away at the text only when his sermons and serving the people could be laid aside, these efforts were also part of a massive industry that involved trans-oceanic shipping and large outlays of cash.

An 1861 article from the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ka Hoku Loa* describes the funding received from the American Bible Society:

> O ka Ahahui Baibala ma Amerika ka i kokua nui i ka hoolaha ana o ka Baibala ma Hawaii nei. He mau $10,000 i haawi ia mai e kela Ahahui no ka pai ana, a no ka hoolaha ana i na Baibala Hawaii. Nolaila ke kumu kuai haahaa o na Baibala maanei. (A1)
>
> ['The American Bible Society was greatly responsible for the disseminating the Bible here in Hawai'i. The Society gave tens of thousands of dollars for the printing and dissemination of the Hawaiian Bibles, and that is the reason that Bibles are so affordable here.']

Artemas Bishop puts the sum at $50,000 (75); more generally, the American Bible Society grew from issuing 24,004 Bibles in their first two years of existence (American Bible Society *Annual Reports* 55) to distributing over a million Bibles per year by the golden jubilee of the Baibala, with an annual income of $700,000 (Judd 58).

Though very well-heeled in the latest “scientific investigations” (Bishop 74) of the Scriptures, the missionaries found little help there for that crucial phase when they were at their weakest: the actual translation. The aim of this chapter is not to provide a word-by-word or sentence-by-sentence critique of their results, but to show how the eventual existence of this translation effected a “translation” of Hawaiian itself. But to support this reading, we must first examine how the missionaries and the Hawaiians understood translation. For hundreds of years, translation as a process was generally uncontested. According to André Lefevere, since the time of the Roman Republic, translation was generally thought of in such rigid categorical binaries as “faithful” or “free” and “right” or “wrong” (6), with 72 scholars supposedly producing identical translations for the Septuagint as the supreme example of faithful translation. The missionaries were heirs to this long tradition of “inspired” translations of the Bible, which assumed that not only were the original authors of the Bible directed by God, but that the translators who took the words of the Bible from one language to another—Hebrew to Greek, Hebrew to Latin, Greek to English—were also divinely inspired.

So with regard to the Septuagint, Philo of Alexandria explains that because each translator was working under such divine inspiration, they therefore arrived at identical phraseology, as if their translations had been dictated to them by God (Metzger 38). Also speaking of the Septuagint translation, the Greek cleric Irenaeus asserts that because all seventy translators had come up with the “same texts with the same words and the same meanings . . . even the pagans present acknowledged that the books had been translated by divine inspiration” (Hengel 39). Other translations, among them the Vulgate Bible and the King James Version, have been, and sometimes continue to be, considered divinely inspired as well. Though contemporary scholarship on translation (and in some cases Christianity) has moved away from these notions, at the time of the missionaries in Hawai‘i, translation as a complete

transfer of meaning was still the overarching understanding.[13] At least in the West, this belief can be partially explained by the fact that most European and American translation audiences were initially multi-lingual, so that translation was often an exercise or a demonstration to show how capable a language was of expressing "great" things—whether poetry and literature, or in this case, the word of God.

The ABCFM's 1822 annual report declares that the Bible is uniquely suited for pure and universal transference:

> There is no language so difficult that it cannot be learned by the patient and zealous missionary; and none so deficient, but that the simple truths of the Gospel can be ultimately expressed in it. This is indeed a striking trait of the Bible, that when honestly translated by men of competent abilities, it conveys the *same* grand and saving doctrines to persons of all classes and characters, however diverse their external condition or their state of intellectual improvement. [emphasis added] (67)

"Same" is the operative word here. This understanding of translation points to the idea that there are universal truths, the "grand and saving doctrines," that can be expressed in all languages. God's sacred word will shine the same light in any language because it, at its core, has a transcendent essence. If any issues arise in communicating these truths, it is not because because of weaknesses in the translator, or in the resulting translation, or that the speakers of the target language have a different worldview and culture, but that their language is "deficient" or that the readers just refuse to accept them.

The deficiency argument will be addressed later in this chapter; here I will examine the claim that the Bible and its translations "convey the *same* grand and saving doctrines." Reading

[13] Almost 150 years later, the highly influential translation theorist and Bible translator Eugene Nida would examine the same sort of ideas of equivalence and correspondence that enabled the missionaries to proceed in this manner. Though he states that "there can be no absolute correspondence between languages" (126), the principles of formal/functional or dynamic correspondence allowed translators to proceed as if that were not true.

a Bible in English is the same as reading a Bible in Cherokee or Hawaiian. All are translations, but in content all are equivalent. That the Hawai‘i missionaries understood scriptural translation this way is confirmed by the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ke Kumu Hawaii*. In 1834, Binamu (Bingham) wrote:

> O ka unuhi ana i ka Paulo olelo i ko Roma, he mea paakiki ia, aka, ke hooikaika nei makou e hooponopono loa i ka unuhi ana, i like io ka olelo Hawaii nei me ka olelo Helene i ku pono ka manao i ole ai a hiki ia Paulo ke hoole mai, “Aole pela ko‘u manao, aole pela ko ke Akua.”
>
> [‘Translating Paul’s words to the Romans is very difficult, but we struggle on so that the translation is absolutely correct, that the Hawaiian be truly the same as the Greek and that the meaning be accurate, so that Paul cannot disagree and say, “That is not what I meant, not what God meant.”’]

Though it is possible that Binamu was not fully aware of the linguistic nuances of every word he used, at this point he had been in Hawai‘i for 14 years, and had already translated a large chunk of the Bible, so it is more than likely that he understood what was conveyed by such Hawaiian words as “ho‘oponopono” and “like.” Furthermore, by not only choosing these words, but intensifying them with “loa” and “‘i‘o,” he was clearly trying to indicate this translation of Paul goes beyond being simply correct to being absolutely accurate. The Hawaiian word “like” in this sense goes beyond claiming that the Hawaiian and the Greek were similar, to insisting that they were truly the same. For the missionaries, then, translation was nothing like the game of telephone, with each successive iteration adding or losing meanings not in the original, but rather, a puzzle to complete by arranging the Hawaiian pieces in precisely the right order to match the picture on the box. This belief was not derived from reading the latest “scientific investigations”; as missionaries, it was in fact the only way they could operate in good faith.

At its heart, translation is actually a highly interpretive act. Translators bring all of their linguistic abilities and cultural knowledge, as well as their ideological and aesthetic biases to a

particular text, re-interpreting and re-authoring it for a new audience. But for Christianity to spread in a manner faithful to its tenets, translations of the Bible must occlude the original—not by denying that the original exists, but by insisting that the translation is *exactly* equivalent. Christianity, and in particular this brand of Protestant Christianity with its emphasis on the Bible as the true path to God, *cannot* bring the Good News to different nations and peoples if the meaning of God's word depends on the language that expresses it.

Hawaiians sensed the problem as well. The word for translation is "unuhi," which refers to the act of reaching into something and pulling something out. The translator therefore reaches into another language and pulls out meaning. Though when unuhi came to mean translation is unclear, its use suggests that through translation, meaning can be extracted, like "grand and saving doctrines," and placed into Hawaiian. It is also fitting that the Hawaiian Bible translation was entitled *Ka Baibala Hemolele.* Though most commonly translated as *The Holy Bible*, "hemolele" has the added valence of perfection, because it has "hemo," removed itself, and "lele," flown, from imperfection and sin. And even when acknowledged by the missionaries as not "perfect," their Bible translation still retained an aura of infallibility. "In looking over the Hawaiian Bible in the several editions, I am far from pronouncing it a perfect work," translator Artemas Bishop concluded: "An approximation to perfect translation is as much as our most sanguine expectations ever aspired to" (75). The distinction here is crucial. Though not a perfect "work" because there are undeniably typos or misunderstandings, as a *translation*, the Baibala approximates perfection because the missionaries created a text that neither Paul nor ke Akua would dispute. Small quibbles might arise here and there about word choice or an idiom, but both missionaries and Hawaiians believed that translation equivalence was possible, and that for spiritual reasons, the Baibala Hemolele could be nothing other than perfect.

When the missionaries did acknowledge errors or mistakes, they were seen as static in the transmission rather than signs of the impossibility of translation itself. Any shortcomings in translation were chalked up to deficits in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi or Hawaiians themselves: "the native

monitors often mistook the true idea of the sacred writer, as conveyed to him through the medium of his own language" (Bishop 74). For the missionaries and those who worked on the translation, there had to be a right and a wrong translation, a faithful and a free. Translation was not interpretation, but a massive act of transfer, of unuhi, of extraction. And because of the sacredness of the Bible, its translation had to be hemolele, perfect.

Figures of Salvation

Though the missionaries did not consider themselves as agents of colonialism because worldy concerns were supposedly outside their purview, the Christianity they brought, and the translations used to spread it, laid the ideological foundations for many of the most exploitive structures associated with the aims of the United States and all other foreign powers in the Pacific. As one of the main "rhetorical technologies that rationalize an ongoing Anglo-American imperialism in the Americas," Eric Cheyfitz observes, "translation was, and still is, the central act of European colonization and imperialism" there (xii). Translation scholar and postcolonial theorist S. Shankar says of Cheyfitz's analysis that "instead of Translation being understood primarily as an instantiation of language, the colonial encounter is understood as an instantiation of Translation" (105). Shankar moves his own analysis away from the notion of translation as tropic and metaphorical, demanding instead a focus on the actual practice of translation, which we shall do here. But parts of Cheyfitz's analysis remain useful when looking at Hawai'i. In *The Poetics of Imperialism*, he pays close attention to how things get made in language, the "poetics" in his title referring to the figurative aspect of language, derived from the idea of poiesis, of making and bringing things into being. Such a poetics is central to imperialism and colonialism, Cheyfitz argues, because how the natives of the Americas appear as figures in the language of the colonizer becomes the justification for treating these natives in various ways.

Through such translations, colonizers “figure” and construct the people, bringing them into a particular kind of being, using language to give the native people particular attributes that would justify their further colonization. Cheyfitz talks about not only how early settlers described the indigenous folks of North America, but also the effects of such narratives and cultural translations:

> What the English and Europeans could not achieve in actuality they achieved textually in these early narratives: the translation of the Indians into proper English. But as the balance of power shifted from Indians to Europeans—and in America this shift was rapid and massive after the Revolution had shattered the Iroquois's power—these narratives became models of actuality. (10)

Since the natives initially outnumbered the settlers, the colonizers could not necessarily force the native peoples to bend to their will. Through translation, however, the colonizers could figure the Native Americans into “proper English.” For instance, even though his people did not believe in the individual ownership of land, Paspehay, the *weroance* of the Algonquin-speaking Indians of the Virginia area, supposedly “sold” his people’s lands to the English colonizers. One of the tools for making this possible was translation. When describing their dealings with these Indians, the settlers translated *weroance*, an Algonquin-language term referring to tribal leaders, as the English word “king,” which “translated Paspehay into English property relations . . . so that the English can recognize him as having ‘sold’ ‘his’ land to the English, who following the ‘legal’ logic of their language can thus claim ‘title’ to this land (60). Through early treaties and encounters, the native leaders became the equivalents of European kings, with the same power to alienate land despite professed communal ownership. (Cheyfitz even argues that articulating the notion of selling land in such Native American languages as those of the Algonquian groups was impossible [8].)

For Cheyfitz, the history of Anglo-American imperialism arises out of the interplay between the proper and the figurative:

> This history begins with, and is still driven by, a theory of metaphor grounded in the desire of what names itself the *domestic* to dominate what it simultaneously distinguishes as the *foreign*—in the desire of what imagines itself as the *literal* or, crucially, the *proper*, to bring what it formulates as the *figurative* under control. (xii)

This urge for domination paradoxically arises out of the inability of the domestic, in this case the missionaries, to communicate with the foreign (In Cheyfitz's analysis, this is why Tarzan must dominate the apes.) Despite their linguistic clumsiness, the colonizers understand themselves and their culture as abiding in the realm of the proper, while the native abides in the realm of the figurative. By attempting to bring the figurative under control of the proper, the colonizer therefore brings the native into the system of European notions of property and identity (xiv).

While initially textual, or at least centered in language, in time this act of translation becomes naturalized, and thus invisible. Each time *weroance*, or mōʻī for that matter, is translated as "king" or "queen" in official contexts makes the next time easier, until the terms seem to become equivalent. At that point, the colonizer no longer realizes—or admits, at any rate—that through language, the native has been actively figured and constructed in this way. A *weroance* simply *is* a king—or at least insofar as this understanding enables the colonizer to get what he wants. These linguistically constructed figures are then reinscribed into literature, laws, and treaties, which bind them "to prescribed paths and which, projected on the Indians proper, are then taken for the proper" (105). As the resulting alienation of land and the replacement of native languages with English accelerate, so too does the claim that native was always understood to be identical to the figure.

Cheyfitz treats "translation" as primarily a metaphorical, cultural, and tropic process. In Hawaiʻi, however, literal linguistic translation enacts these changes through the production of the Bible, and later the law, which will be the subject of the next chapter. Through scriptural translation, the missionaries seek to turn Hawaiians into figures worthy of salvation. Far beyond

racism rooted in the individual missionaries, this figuration was an institutional mandate of the ABCFM. When the *Thaddeus* first anchored, the foreign influx into Hawai‘i was already four decades old. Hawaiians had taken up many of the foreign modes of dress and comportment, and Thomas Hopu, George Kaumuali‘i, William Kanui, and John Honoli‘i from the Foreign Mission School had been with the missionaries for 160 days, to prepare them for what they would encounter. And yet, they were horrified when they first gazed upon the Hawaiians who greeted their ship and who would later shower them with foodstuffs and hospitality. Mission head and soon-to-be Bible translator Hiram Bingham recalls that:

> the appearance of destitution, degradation, and barbarism, among the chattering, and almost naked savages . . . was appalling. Some of our number, with gushing tears, turned away from the spectacle. Others with firmer nerve continued their gaze, but were ready to exclaim, “Can these be human beings! . . . Can such beings be civilized? Can they be Christianized? (81)

As he looks back over the decades in his recollections *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands*, Bingham answers these questions with a smug “Yes.”

‘Ōpūkaha‘ia had been the first evidence of that “yes”; in fact, the ABCFM had used ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s salvation, along with that of Hopu and the others, to justify their fundraising. In a sort of Russian nesting doll of figuration, as living, breathing proof that the heathen could be redeemed, ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia mā confirmed the prevailing belief in Christianity’s power, and therefore got donors to loosen their purse strings. Furthermore, ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia and the others themselves affirmed the script that they not only embodied, but performed. During the many fundraising tours the Hawaiian youths made, and in ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s 1819 memoir, they spoke of their ascent from “ignorance” and “heathenism.” Whether they truly believed it, this was the language and context that those who taught them English and Christianity offered. Or as Cheyfitz would put it, such constructed figures had prescribed paths, and when projected on the Hawaiians, these paths are then taken for the proper.

Similar to an echo chamber, the figurations continually reinforced themselves with each new encounter. Because of these prescribed paths, in her journal, Nancy Ruggles, who was also on the Thaddeus, describes the Hawaiian women she first encounters as “monstrous” (22). Upon arriving three years later, Charles Samuel Stewart, one of the second company of missionaries, echoed his predecessor Bingham, describing these “wretched creatures” as “half-man and half-beast,” and asking “do they not form a link in creation, connecting man with the brute?” (64). Even Betsey Stockton, the freed slave and first single American woman to be sent abroad as a missionary, and therefore something of a figure herself, reproduces Stewart’s and Bingham’s sentiments about Hawaiians:

> their appearance was that of half man and half beast—naked—except a narrow strip of tapa round their loins. When they first came on board, the sight chilled our very hearts. The ladies retired to the cabin, and burst into tears; and some of the gentlemen turned pale: my own soul sickened within me, and every nerve trembled. (36)

Because the missionaries had come to save heathens, the Hawaiians had to be initially figured as beasts, subhuman, chattering, and savage for them to do so. Otherwise the mission had no mission—if not debased, Hawaiians would not be in need of salvation.

This is not to say that the missionaries’ disgust and horror at Hawaiians was feigned or strategic. In fact, there was *no other way* that they could could have seen Hawaiians. The expense and labor of a mission was only justified if the natives were in dire need of salvation, and salvation was only a true accomplishment if visited upon the wretched. So the missionaries figured Hawaiians as such.

The mission was therefore to raise Hawaiians up from their status as the very basest of creatures by bestowing upon them the gift of humanity through Christ: “Before any great results can be expected, the rudiments of moral truth must be brought to the minds of multitudes; the conscience is to be formed and enlightened; the heart is to be assailed by the simple, yet

commanding, motives of the gospel" (ABCFM *Instructions* 40). All that was necessary for Hawaiians to become human could therefore be supplied by the missionaries, and whether they accurately understood the people or not, as the missionaries enacted more and more of these figurations and cultural translations, the cumulative result assumed the power of actuality. Or as Niranjana explains, "In forming a certain kind of subject, in presenting particular versions of the colonized, translation brings into being overarching concepts of reality and representation" (2).

This projected dehumanization of Hawaiians was therefore paradoxically the first stage in the erasure of difference, a process commonly executed by translation in colonial situations. Though it may seem counterintuitive that open disgust is laying the foundation for erasing difference, through their distaste and visceral disregard for Hawaiian humanity, the missionaries enfolded the natives within a teleological model of development that was (and still is) so prevalent in the Western understanding of the world. Hawaiians and other Indigenous peoples were situated within a hierarchy of peoples that defined them as lesser-developed humans who could aspire to the telos of enlightened European and American society. Binamu's smug "*Yes*" therefore testifies to his certainty that the Bible, and through it Christianity, would move Hawaiians up this developmental ladder. The barbarous and savage Hawaiians and other peoples under the threat of colonization therefore could not possess epistemically different ways of relating to each other and to the world, since a self-sufficient, culturally complete people with their own proud traditions and cultural practices, and different aspirations for their lāhui, would have no need to be saved through the Bible. Even if Christianity managed to gain a foothold, it would only be as a foreign curiosity. If however Hawaiians were seen as situated within the Christian teleogical model of the world, then the Bible and its attendant civilizing powers would represent the only path available for a savage and benighted people to achieve the telos of Euro-America. Hawaiians were therefore not autonomous or distinctive. They were simply waiting to be translated up into the modern era, and this erasure of essential difference, but insistence on retarded development, became the justification for the missionaries'

transformation of Hawaiians from chattering, bestial savages into people worthy of the Christian God's grace. And translating the Bible would be the key to their ascendance, and eventual salvation.

The Language of Salvation

What the missionaries themselves along with some historians who were their contemporaries were saying reveals how Hawaiians were being figured into a salvable people. Examples arise throughout the Bible translation process, not in terms of the word- and sentence-level transactions between ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi and English, but through how the Bible was translated and discussed. In this section, I will focus on who is presented as carrying out the translation, and how ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi is presented as deficient, which supposedly justified the missionaries' practice of making up new words.

Who actually did the translation? Although missionary correspondence and independent sources list which missionaries translated which sections of the Bible, given the missionaries' language limitations, Hawaiians undoubtedly played a major role in the translation. And yet, although Richards mentions regularly working with David Malo (*1826 Annual Report* 77) and sometimes the "governor" (Kuakini) gets mentioned as assisting (*1827 Annual Report* 93), by and large, the Hawaiians who helped with the translation are not named. An 1857 article in *Ka Hae Hawaii* provides some familiar names:

> Eia kekahi mau kokua i ka unuhi olelo ana, o Keoni Ii ia Binamu, o Davida Malo me Hoapili ia Rikeke, a o Kuakini me Kamakau ia Tatina ma i Kailua. ("No ka unuhi" 57)
>
> ['Here are some of the helpers in the translation process: John ʻĪʻī with Bingham, David Malo and Hoapili with Richards, and Kuakini and Kamakau with Thurston and the others in Kailua.']

But the use of “kekahi mau” [‘some of the’] suggests that there were indeed more, and Richards says that he would read his translations “to a number of people” (*1826 Annual Report* 77). Artemas Bishop also reported that the translators would avail themselves of the “best native aid” (75), but there is little to no indication of who these natives might be.

It would be easy, and probably justified, to chalk this erasure up to the missionaries’ chauvinism, racism, or casual disregard for Hawaiians, apparent in the comments upon first arriving about the barbarous and savage nature of the people. But while some of this may be at play, that the missionaries acknowledge elsewhere they could not have carried out this translation at all without the cooperation of Hawaiians rules out the possibility of easy dismissal alone. William Richards’ account of his cooperative translation process suggests how sanguine the missionaries actually were about their lack of language proficiency. “My inability has lain in my ignorance of the language,” he writes, so

> The course I pursue is this. In the morning I take Knapp’s Testament, Schleusner’s Lexicon, Dodnedge’s Exposition and a few other helps and strictly examine the passage I design to translate. In the afternoon, *Maro* [Malo], my teacher comes, and Taua, the Tahitan [*sic*]. I give the passage to Maro according to the best knowledge I have of the language. Then Taua gives it to him from the Tahitan [sic] translation, then Maro puts it into pure Hawaiian and I write it down. (*1826 Annual Report* 77)

Bishop also claimed that “the labor of obtaining the true interpretation of obscure passages was comparatively easy, to that of finding suitable words and phrases by which to express it in the Hawaiian language” (75), and so, just as the missionaries had consulted Thomas Kendall’s Māori grammar to guide their efforts with the speller and other translations, they also relied on translations coming out of Tahiti to aid their Bible translation. In fact, they welcomed any assistance at all.

Much is made of the arrival of William Ellis at the strong urging of the Hawaiian mission because he was well-versed in Tahitian, and quickly able to communicate with Hawaiians, serving as a conduit that granted the ABCFM missionaries greater access to the people. But for the translation of the Bible, the handful of converted Tahitians who either came with Ellis or at the request of the mission were of greater value, because they could compare notes with the Hawaiians about the word choices for the Tahitian scriptures. And yet, although it seems like they played an important role in the translation process, like the Hawaiians involved, these Tahitians are barely mentioned at all. Though the missionaries themselves looked at the Tahitian translations, alongside the Greek, Latin, and English (Ballou and Carter 16; Loomis, E., 8 Mar 1825, 29), their still limited Hawaiian-language proficiency probably meant that they were limited to seeking out Hawaiian analogues to the Tahitian words they could recognize.

For the most part, the missionaries were quite honest about their language deficiencies, and acknowledged that Hawaiians (and Tahitians) were crucial to the translation process. Why then were John Papa ʻĪʻī, David Malo, Kēlou Kamakau, Hoapili, and Kuakini, some of the most respected Hawaiian intellectuals of the time, consigned to the footnotes in accounts of the translation process? Though at least partly the result of missionary chauvinism, the more likely explanation is that for the Bible translation to be successful, they *cannot* be mentioned. The missionaries are the ones bringing salvation to Hawaiʻi, with the Bible translation as the main pillar supporting their efforts. They possess the religious training, the missionary zeal, the religious imperatives. They are the bearers of the light. If however the benighted savages were responsible for the translation, and therefore necessary contributors to spreading Christianity's influence across the lāhui, how could this Bible be trusted as truly representing the word of God? If important parts of the translation came from the Hawaiians themselves, wouldn't that also mean that they provided some of the keys to their salvation? And that some of these were even grounded in their knowledge of heathen traditions and culture? At a time when the missionaries hesitated to baptize Hawaiians until they were absolutely sure their conversion had

fully taken hold, it was unthinkable that Hawaiians could be recognized as prime actors in the production of the main avenue to salvation.

The best way to explain this is to turn to two Hawaiian concepts that will appear throughout this dissertation: ea and mana. Ea means many things, but the important shades here are life, breath, sovereignty, and rising. None of these words are equivalents; ea exists where they overlap. Ea is our connection to the ʻāina of Hawaiʻi, and also what Hawaiians exercise when we control our lāhui. For this reason, the anniversary of the return of Hawaiian control over Hawaiʻi after a brief takeover by a British agent in 1843 is called Lā Hoʻihoʻi Ea—the day when ea was returned. Mana is a power or presence—a metaphorical weight almost—that inheres in all things. Anything of potential importance or value—places, people, akua, pōhaku, fishing implements—possesses mana. To translate hoʻomana, to give mana or make something have mana, as "religion" is a misguided but extremely common practice, but it suggests something about the power of the process.

I bring up both mana and ea here because they are what is at stake. By putting their breath, their ea, into the words of the Hawaiian Bible, the aliʻi and knowledgeable kāhuna who helped the missionaries are infusing that work with mana, and growing the ea of the lāhui as well. Though the missionaries never would have explained it this way, and were clearly unqualified as translators, they had to focus the attention on themselves, because anything more than mentioning the scant handful of names of such Hawaiian-language experts as ʻĪʻī, Malo, Kamakau, Kuakini, and Hoapili would acknowledge that Hawaiians had their own mana and ea outside of what the Bible was going to bring them.

Denying this possibility led to some interesting logical turns in the missionaries' accounts of the translation process. For instance, Artemas Bishop's recollections quoted a few paragraphs ago take a surprising turn. Because the missionaries' command of Hawaiian was shaky, "We constantly availed ourselves of the best native aid we could procure to put each

sentence into the true idiom of the language." This did not however mean that these experts *understood* these sentences:

> as the native monitor often mistook the true idea of the sacred writer, as conveyed to him through the medium of his own language, he was liable to give us a wrong sentence, according to his own conception of the idea. A constant vigilance was therefore necessary on our part, in order to detect his mistakes, and take nothing for granted as correct which the native assistant proposed, and much effort and ingenuity was often required to get him to comprehend the true meaning which we wished him to clothe in suitable phraseology. (75)

The native speaker is blamed somehow for mistaking what the sacred writer was saying. In a footnote to his detailed analysis of the Bible translation, Kapali Lyon remarks that "It is curious that Bishop's mean-spirited account actually censures Hawaiians, rather than missionary ineptitude, and then praises his own and his ABCFM colleagues' 'vigilance' in keeping the Hawaiians on track" (143). The use of the passive voice when describing how the true idea of the sacred writer was "conveyed" to the Hawaiian expert "through the medium of his own language" erases the missionary translator's halting and incomplete understanding of the language as a possible cause for any mistakes, leaving the Hawaiians responsible for any errors in "conveying" what the Bible was saying. But if the primary goal is to erase, or ignore, the role of the lāhui Hawai'i's mana and ea in figuring Hawaiians as salvable people, then the mental gymnastics Bishop performs here make sense. Hawaiians cannot be the agents of their own deliverance. The potential weak points in the translation are their language, and themselves. Only missionary vigilance can insure accuracy and spiritual progress.

That same leap in logic takes place with regard to 'ōlelo Hawai'i. Especially early on in their language learning, the missionaries frequently comment on the paucity of Hawaiian. Its lack. How there is not enough raw material to craft a translation of the Holy Bible from it. Although it had little to no familiarity with the Hawaiian language, or with Choctaw, Cherokee or

the languages of other heathens they were saving, the ABCFM instructed the second company to expect this: “the progress of divine truth among pagans, speaking a strange tongue, and not even having any language adapted to moral subjects, must be slow at first” (*Instructions* 40). Apparently, the deficiency of native languages was a matter of general knowledge, and Artemas Bishop found what he was supposed to, describing ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi as “a language which had never been cultivated, and whose words are limited by the paucity of ideas attained by an untutored people” (74).[14] As for Sheldon Dibble, who joined the four initial missionaries as a translator of Hawaiian, he remarked that “another obstacle may be imperfectly termed a destitution of ideas, and a consequent destitution of words on the subject of true religion” (135). Although Hawaiians had been writing highly metaphorical mele across multiple genres and worshipping their 400,000 akua for more than a thousand years, somehow the language could not express religious concepts. Of course, the operative word for Dibble is “true,” but ignoring or discounting a trove of “religious” vocabulary, then complaining about not having anything to work with when translating a spiritual text, seems a little disingenuous. Dibble goes on to explain that “in consequence of the destitution of terms, missionaries are obliged in their conversation, their preaching, and in their translations of the scriptures too, to use words nearest allied to the sense they would express” (137–138). What Dibble is complaining about here is the essence of translation—what anyone must do when moving from one language to another. No direct equivalence ever exists between words in different languages.

[14] These descriptions of the language as lacking are repeated so frequently that contemporary scholars will still sometimes take them up uncritically. In Kapali Lyon’s excellent study, he states that “words and concepts taken for granted in Massachusetts were simply not available in Hawaiian. Traditional Hawaiian understanding of sexuality, social structures, and especially religious attitudes and expectations had far more in common with the Greco-Roman society villified in the book of Revelation than it did with nascent Christianity, Hellenistic Judaism, or, especially, New England Puritanism” (117).

While he makes an interesting point about Hawaiian society’s resemblances to other cultures, it remains a mistake that ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi was not supple enough to translate foreign concepts. Even if a culture does not recognize or value a certain practice, it will almost certainly be able to describe it in its language. Thus, while it might be true that ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi likely did not have word-for-word or phrase-for-phrase substitutions available, it is untrue that these concepts could not be expressed in Hawaiian.

While paternalism runs through these assessments of Hawaiian, the conviction that the people must be tutored ties back into the missionaries' overarching project of figuration. Though the missionaries' poor language skills prevented them from recognizing the depths of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, they attributed it to problems with the language itself. The solution they adopted as early as 1824 should therefore not be a surprise:

> A considerable number of words must doubtless be introduced from the Greek into the Hawaiian version, as there are many terms, and many ideas, for which there is nothing in this language to answer; even the most common terms, faith, holiness, throne, dominion, angel, demoniac, which so frequently occur in the New Testament, cannot be expressed with precision by any terms in the Hawaiian language. (*Sandwich Island Mission Journal* 21 Oct 1824, 50)

The Hawaiian term for making up new words is "haku"; it also means boss or lord, and is the word actually chosen to translate "*the* Lord"—more evidence for Eric Cheyfitz's claim that "The imperialist believes that, literally, everything can be translated into his terms; indeed, that everything always already exists in these terms and is only waiting to be liberated" (195). Though the missionaries probably did not notice that choosing to haku new words gave them this particular status in relation to Hawaiian, the practice reinforces their larger acts of figuration, designed to insure that they must be the ones to introduce and explain concepts of salvation to the Hawaiians.

Here is how Bishop describes this process of haku:

> as our investigations into the structure of the language advanced, we discovered that by the combination of simple and familiar words descriptive of the thing intended to be expressed, whether a noun or verb, we were able to form new words to an *indefinite* extent, in perfect accordance with the genius of the language, and intelligible to the native reader. The *constant use* of this power enabled us to meet and overcome nearly every difficulty arising from the paucity

> of Hawaiian words, besides enriching the language with many hundreds of new terms, which are now common in use throughout the archipelago. (74) [emphasis added]

In short, every time the translators encountered a problem, they just made up a new word. Though they followed a rubric to guide the adoption of new words, the allure of making up new words and controlling their meaning must have been seductive for those missionary translators floundering in the shallows of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. The power to haku also countered the reticence of people like Amos Starr Cooke, who as mentioned earlier thought he could better learn the language if he actually cared about Hawaiians. By making up words, the missionaries were able to create safe zones for themselves within the language. They did not need to bump up against the mana of the Hawaiian cultural values and mores, the life and the death, embedded in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi because they could dictate exactly what a word meant. Though Bingham downplayed the extent of this process in his memoir, saying that "A few foreign words are introduced, and a few original words retained" in the Bible translation (531), Bishop puts the number somewhere north of "many hundreds" (74).

Bishop is confident that the words they have created are "in perfect accordance with the genius of the language, and intelligible to the native reader." Dibble, whom J. S. Green called one of the best missionary translators (Forbes *Vol. 2* 140), is less certain—not about the act of haku, but about just how intelligible the resulting words are:

> In many instances they succeed, in a measure, by circumlocution; in others they use a sort of patch-work of native words. For instance: manao means thought, and io means true or real;—so the combination manaoio, is used for faith. Again, manao means thought, and lana means buoyant,—so the combination, manaolana, is made by us to express hope. Ala means to rise, hou means again, and ana is a pariticipial termination;—so we make alahouana to signify the rising again, or the resurrection. We are obliged to manufacture many of the most

> important words expressive of religious subjects. *It is perplexing to the ignorant people, but it is unavoidable*. (137–138) [emphasis added]

In practice, these portmanteau words must often have been as suggestive and bewildering as such contemporary fusions as *bromance, frenemy, froyo, webinar,* or *cronut*. With almost two hundred years of usage, manaʻolana and manaʻoʻiʻo have become normalized. But some words—alahouʻana, for instance—can still rankle, much in the way *Belieber* does.

The process of haku allowed the missionaries to believe in the veracity and faithfulness of their translation, because they are the ones dictating that manaʻolana means hope, and that alahouʻana, as ugly as it is, means resurrection. Without the certainty that accompanies making up new words, at least for the first couple of decades the missionaries could not have so easily believed in the accuracy of their Biblical translations. But this was a moot point. Ultimately, neither the beauty nor the accuracy of the translation mattered; only the existence of the Holy Bible in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi did. Once Hawaiians could read it, ask for it, and take it into their homes, they were a salvable people, worthy of the blessings the mission was promising through publishing.

Once the entire Bible translation was completed and published in 1839, “ua koho ka Aha Misionari ia Binamu laua me Bihopa, e hooponopono hou i ka Baibala okoa, no ke pai hou ia” [‘the Mission council chose Bingham and Bishop to revise the entire Bible for a reprinting’] (“No ka unuhi” 58). When Bingham returned to the United States, Bishop was left in charge of this revision. He eventually reported that around 7,000 changes were made, mostly “corrections of the Hawaiian idiom,” which he still was attributing to “the difficulty of finding corresponding words and phrases in the native language to express the ideas of the sacred writers” (75). Though Hawaiians such as Barenaba were writing in to the missionary-run Hawaiian-language newspapers to correct words being misspelled in the Bible translation (Charlot 42), no Hawaiian publically called the translation a failure, or called for a complete overhaul. This should not be surprising. When Binamu and others told Hawaiians that the translation of the Baibala was

“maikaʻi” [‘good, proper, well-done’] (91), and even “hemolele,” or perfect, or when they patiently preached and taught Hawaiians what new words like manaʻolana and manaʻoʻiʻo meant, the Hawaiians took their word for it. By translating the Bible and figuring the Hawaiians as a salvable people, the missionaries claimed to be the kumu and mākua of the people—their teachers and parents.

The fidelity of the translation was also taken for granted by those without a direct hand in its production and maintenance. The visitors and haole residents who saw the result assumed it was “maikaʻi.” Richard Harvey Dana, Jr., for instance, claimed admiringly that “I found no hut without a Bible and hymnbook” (*Album* 17), these being the only signs he needed to confirm the Hawaiians’ progress toward salvation. Still later accounts, such as those by historian John Lydgate and Chief Justice Albert Francis Judd, praised the translation enthusiastically. Considering his importance in shaping Hawaiian law, which we will see in Chapter 2, it is not surprising that Judd approved of this translation. On the jubilee of the Baibala Hemolele’s first printing, he echoed Dana about its ubiquity in Hawaiian households, and celebrated it:

> There can be no more useful thing done than to supply every Hawaiian house with a Bible—from Hawaii to Niihau. . . . Better let the Hawaiian be without his calabash and his meat dish, his holding of land, his bed, or his right to vote, rather than be without his Bible. (57)

For Judd, neither the aliʻi nor their advisors are the equals of the translators who made this possible, for “they who furnish a people with the Bible, which is the bread and water of life, are more to be honored than those who found a kingdom” (57). For a Supreme Court justice to elevate the Baibala above the ea of the people, or even their need for food, shows how this translated scripture came to override or erase such Hawaiian concerns as ea, ʻāina, lāhui, ʻai, ai, nā mea a pau. This first major act of translation by missionaries in the Hawaiian kingdom also contributed to introducing, reinforcing, and institutionalizing many of the colonial structures—including Western understandings of relationships to land and people, and heteropatriarchy as a

foundational structure of society—that would come to damage so profoundly the nohona Hawai‘i—the way we live as Hawaiians.

Historians such as Lydgate went still further, crediting the missionaries with saving the Hawaiian language through their translation:

> With characteristic wisdom they made use of the best Hawaiian learning available, so that the translation was rendered into idiomatic Hawaiian, not Hawaiianized English. The result has been that the Hawaiian Bible, being the one classic vernacular, has stamped the language and given it permanent form. In a word, it has done for Hawaiian what the King James version has done for English. *If it had not been for this fixative influence of the Bible the language would probably have gone to pieces, or degenerated into a mongrel slang.* As it is, the Hawaiian Bible will pass into History as the classic presentation of the Hawaiian language; which surely reflects no small degree of credit on the Missionaries. [emphasis added]. (85)

The Bible translation has certainly passed “into History as the classic presentation of the Hawaiian language.” Jack Keppeler, the project manager of the Bible digitization project Baibala.org, claims that as “the first major document in the conversion of an oral tradition into a standardized written language,” the “Baibala Hemolele was *the* primary document in the Hawaiian language.” Helen Kaowili, the assistant project manager, agrees, asserting that “this translation gives us the Hawaiian language as it was heard in 1830, as it was first recorded” (Adamski).

As we have seen, however, the Baibala Hemolele was not a “recording” of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in any way, shape, or form. The supposed “fixative influence” that Lydgate describes was actually a force for great change. Though still a cherished document for many Hawaiians, and often the text from which many kūpuna learned Hawaiian (Lyon 140), a translation—*any* translation—should not be the standard by which a language is judged. Those truly responsible

for preventing ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i from “going to pieces” or “degenerating into a mongrel slang” were the kānaka maoli themselves. Initially skeptical of the missionaries and the literacy they offered, the Hawaiians’ pursuit of alphabetic literacy nevertheless became a national effort. Largely by means of translated texts, by 1832, 900 missionary schools were educating 53,000 students, mainly adults—roughly 40 percent of the total Hawaiian population (Beyer 8). In telling contrast, as late as 1837, only 1,259 Hawaiians had become members of the church—though that number would soon jump exponentially, thanks to the completion of the Bible translation, and accompanying spiritual revival near the end of the decade (Frear “Statute” 22). And only then did educating children become the priority, as the nation moved towards universal literacy in Hawaiian.

The first Hawaiian-language newspaper, *Ka Lama Hawaii* [‘The Hawaiian Torch’], was published in 1834 at Lahainaluna High School. Only four years later, Laura Fish Judd, wife of the missionary doctor Gerritt P. Judd, wrote that the proportion of Hawaiians who could read and write in their own language was “estimated as greater than any country in the world, except for Scotland and New England” (79). Twenty years later, the *New York Tribune* reported that Hawai‘i had surpassed New England (Day and Loomis 31). Literacy grew so quickly and became so widespread that by 1841, an understanding of “reading, writing, geography, and arithmetic” was required for the positions of governor, judge, tax officer, land agent, or “any office over any other man.” Furthermore, couples could only marry if the both could read (Hawaii Department of Public Instruction 49).

Though educational opportunities and publication venues such as the newspapers initially came through the mission, in almost no time at all, Hawaiians grasped literacy and Western education so well that they began to take over the literary means of production themselves. Both the missionaries and the foreign business establishment were soon scrambling to keep up with kānaka ‘ōiwi often wielding not only bilingual literacy, but the specific translation skills necessary to navigate that literacy, and to forward the interests of the lāhui.

These Hawaiians would soon be authoring and publishing their own laws, books, newspapers, and pamphlets, creating original works in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi and translating important texts from other languages. Print was also enlisted to mālama, or care for, traditional moʻolelo and mele, and certain cultural practices. Editorials in the newspapers called out corruption, whether kanaka or haole. Poetically worded petitions from around the kingdom advocated limiting the power of the haole. Though a stunning and unqualified success for the mission, alphabetic literacy also gave Hawaiians powerful tools for realizing their own sovereignty. The next several decades would be highly contested ground, with foreign influences trying to use translation and literacy to curb Hawaiian ea, while Hawaiians in turn were using the same tools to assert their own powers.

CHAPTER 2: FROM KĀNĀWAI TO LAW: TRANSLATION AND THE LEGAL SYSTEM IN THE HAWAIIAN KINGDOM

“E Boasa, ua lohe anei ‘oe?”

Boaz snapped out of his reverie, quickly dipping his nib into the ink and noting the changes the ali‘i had requested, “‘Ae, ‘ae, e ke ali‘i.”

The mō‘ī and ali‘i were ranged about him. Various kahu moved about unobtrusively in the background, bringing refreshments or attending to the needs of the ali‘i, sometimes ducking close to whisper something to one of their charges.

Despite it all the ali‘i all watched him intently. It was unfamiliar but important work.

They had been at it all day for the last three days already, and Boaz was feeling the strain. But this was exactly why he had gone to Lahainaluna.

Well, maybe not exactly. Everyone who went to school there was trained to serve the lāhui in some way, but he had never expected that he would be the one writing laws for the kingdom.

He glanced at Malo and the others. They had all gone to school together, but the mō‘ī felt that he had gotten the best grasp of political economy, which is why he was here now, reading aloud the laws he had written.

He was proud of his grasp of English, and he had used the haole laws as models where appropriate, but he was glad that the ali‘i were here to make sure that the laws fit with what was pono for the lāhui.

After each day’s session of getting rewrites from the ali‘i, he spent several more hours incorporating them and recopying out the revised laws. He wished he could close his eyes, just for a bit.

“E Boasa, ua lohe anei ‘oe?”

While translation had a huge ideological impact on how Hawaiians were to be perceived—i.e. as a salvable people—in the first decades of the nineteenth century, translation initially played little role in the day-to-day lives of kānaka living outside of the ports. Those who lived out in the countryside and were known as kua‘āina (the back of the land / those who carried the land on their back / those who worked the land), had few dealings with foreigners save for the occasional sightseer or migrant missionary. As the kingdom moved away from the familiar traditional governmental structures to what would become a constitutional monarchy, however, translation increasingly came to dictate much of what kānaka were allowed to do in their daily lives, specifically through its inextricable role in law. Law was the principal agent in the refigurations of Hawaiians through translation that wrought massive changes, redefining how Hawaiians could interact with the ‘āina and even with each other.

Unlike many things foreigners presented as requirements for a civilized life—stuffy clothes, enforced monogamy, last names—Hawaiians were not unfamiliar with the idea of law. Though not as universal and regularized as the kind of law the haole envisioned, the kapu system had governed Hawaiian life for countless generations. It was complex, and often time- and place-based, as when for instance kapu were placed that restricted the gathering of particular fish during their spawning season. Kapu often had to do with the maintenance and sanctity of mana, which is the power inhering, and sometimes accumulating, in all things. For the ali‘i, kapu mandated or prohibited certain actions depending on context, and these kapu came into play for them at all times. For the maka‘āinana, however, while still governed by the kapu, their distance from ali‘i, both physically and spiritually, likely affected their behaviors and activities less. For instance, preparing and eating food were activities strictly divided between men and women. Men were responsible for all the food preparation, preparing separate imu, or earth ovens, for the men and the women, who then had to eat separately. Yet Mary Kawena Pukui remarks that: “Though the mashing of cooked taro corms to make poi was normally the work of men every woman knew how to do it and would make poi for herself when left alone”

(Handy and Pukui *Polynesian* 176). It would make sense that practicality at times took precedent over kapu, particularly outside of ali‘i oversight.

The word that came to be used for “law” in a Western sense is “kānāwai,” a term that referred to particular named edicts that akua and ali‘i could proclaim. The most well-known kānāwai today is ke kānāwai Māmalahoa. It is enshrined in the State of Hawai‘i’s constitution, in translation, and is depicted on the Honolulu Police Department’s badge. Though Hawai‘i’s current status as an occupied nation makes such uses gross appropriations of our cultural patrimony by the occupying settler colonial establishment, they suggest just how ubiquitous the Māmalahoa is. Kamehameha I famously came up with this kānāwai after raiding a fishing village as a young ali‘i. When he came ashore, the villagers fled. Kamehameha gave chase to two fishermen, but when his foot became lodged in a lava crevice, one of them struck him on the head with a paddle. Kamehameha’s edict arose from his shame about his own unprovoked attack: “E hele ka ‘elemakule a moe i ke ala; e hele ka luahine a moe i ke ala; e hele ke keiki a moe i ke ala, ‘a‘ole mea pepehi wale iho” (Hoolumahiehie *Kamehameha* 3 Apr 1906) [‘Let the old man go and lie in the road, let the old woman go and lie in the road, let the child go and lie in the road, none shall hurt them’]. The kākau mo‘olelo (historian/storyteller/author) Ho‘oulumāhiehie even claims that wishing to proclaim the Māmalahoa across the entire pae ‘āina is what drove Kamehameha to bring all of the islands under his sway (*Kamehameha* 12 Jun 1905).

Another well-known kānāwai was the Kai‘okia. After Kekaihinali‘i, the great flood, Kāne proclaimed this law separating the land from the sea (Pukui and Elbert 127). It was also the restriction that Pele placed upon her lover Lohi‘au, after coming to him in a dream. When she sent her youngest sister Hi‘iakaikapoliopele[15] from Hawai‘i Island in the east to fetch Lohi‘au on

[15] For a wide-ranging and simultaneously in-depth analysis of the mo‘olelo of Pele and her youngest sister Hi‘iakaikapoliopele, see ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui’s *Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi‘iaka*. Also see Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio’s 2018 dissertation *(Re)membering 'Upena of*

Kaua‘i in the west, she proclaimed the Kai‘okia. Everyone was to keep separate from Lohi‘au upon pain of death; none were to sleep with him (Ho‘oulumāhiehie *Hi‘iakaikapoliopele* 12). Another familiar proclamation, the Mau‘umae kānāwai, kept canoes off the water for three days (*Mooolelo* 20). Though often associated with particular individuals, divine or earthly, and usually contingent on time or context, kānāwai were still similar enough to Western notions of law that Hawaiians could make the connection.

For some, it is tempting to look back at our history and believe that at one point we were governed by our traditional kapu and kānāwai, then at a later point we had a system of Western laws giving primacy to English, and that a gentle curve of gradual but inevitable change joined them, with translation the means for the smooth transition from deficient ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i to the linguistic riches of English. Yet as with any major cultural transition, what actually occurred was a contested zig-zag that could have completely reversed course several times. To this day, Hawaiians have been pressuring for changes in the laws regarding the status of our language; we shall see a few examples in Chapter 5. But by paying attention to the course of law in the nineteenth century kingdom, we can trace how translation functioned as the engine domesticating Hawaiians and Hawaiian cultural understandings into forms legible to foreigners[16] through a process of figuration, similar to the one described in Chapter 1, that literally stripped Hawaiians of their connection to ‘āina and severely damaged their legal agency.

While poetry is often identified as the highest use of language because of the art and skill involved, in pragmatic terms, legal language is the most powerful because it affects people’s lives, dictating our actions and how we interact with the world around us. According to post-colonial language scholar Rachel Leow, “of all the aspects of governance, the negotiation

---

Intimacies: A Kanaka Maoli Mo'olelo Beyond Queer Theory for a discussion of the intimate pilina found within the mo‘olelo and the power that comes from their recovery.

[16] For an incisive analysis of the ramifications of this kind of domesticating legibility for both nineteenth century Hawaiians and contemporary Hawaiians in the sovereignty movement (and a brief discussion of translation and the Seventh Commandment), see Kēhaulani Kauanui’s *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty*, particularly Chapter Three: “Gender, Marriage, and Coverture: A New Proprietary Relationship” and Chapter Four: “‘Savage’ Sexualities.”

of justice and social conduct is where the most attention to language and its communicative nuances is required, and where the daily business of governing comes most closely into contact with the largest range of society" (33). As Kēhaulani Kauanui asserts, there was still "some consistency of customary practice outside formal law" (41%), particularly in regards to how Hawaiian women were affected by the legal system, but as Jon Osorio notes

> All of the most significant transformations in nineteenth-century Hawai'i came about as legal changes: in rulership, in land tenure, in immigration, and especially in the meaning of identity and belonging. The Hawaiian saying "I ka 'ōlelo nō ke ola, i ka 'ōlelo nō ka make" reminds us that language is a creator and a destroyer, and law is nothing if not language. (*Dismembering* 251)

Though I would add massive population decline due to disease to the list as a significant transformation that did not come about due to legal change, his point is well-taken. "I ka 'ōlelo nō ke ola, i ka 'ōlelo nō ka make," is also often translated to mean that "in language there is life, and in language there is death," and that really underscores not just the power of language in the law, but particularly in nineteenth century Hawai'i, the power of translation. After all, if life and death are in our 'ōlelo, what happens when you translate into English? Though it was not always seen as such in the nineteenth century, translation is a dependent, interpretive act, which necessitates an uneven transfer of the ola and the make in 'ōlelo.

For Osorio, legal language was the prime force undermining mana and ea:

> Our submission to the language of law and especially to its ubiquity and its fickleness is what, I believe, has so altered our sense of ourselves and our inherent sovereignty. It was law that positioned Natives and haole as subjects and citizens in the kingdom through the promulgation and termination of constitutions, through the election of Native and haole officials, all of which, in the long run, deprived Natives of any meaningful participation in their own governance. In the process the kānaka were continually subjected to the

> pronouncements of their difference and inferiority, which both enabled and validated their dispossession. (*Dismembering* 251)

One important disagreement I would have with Osorio's assertion, however, is that *law* did not position kānaka maoli as subjects and citizens in the kingdom, *translation* did. As they had been for generations, kānaka were still makaʻāinana. They still saw and carried themselves in ways that venerated the aliʻi and the ʻāina. Trouble arose when translation began to say that makaʻāinana was the same as "subject" or "citizen." Hawaiians were figured as having the same rights, duties, and motivations as any proper Englishman or American—no more and no less. Not only did translation redefine the word, it redefined our relationships and connections to the land and to the government.

This figuration is the subject of this chapter. During the 1820s and 1830s, when the Bible was being prepared, translation was going in one direction—into Hawaiian—and only a handful of people could participate. In the late 1830s and 1840s, however, as the nation increasingly assumed the forms of western law and a constitutional monarchy, and as more haole assumed powerful positions in government, translation became increasingly necessary for the day-to-day operations of the kingdom. It also became multidirectional—into, but also out of Hawaiian—as more and more Hawaiians translated texts for Hawaiian purposes, developing a cosmopolitan practice that we will examine in the next chapter. Such intentions clashed with those of the haole, with the assertions of each group seen as threatening to disempower the other. But as this chapter will show, because of the model that prevailed, Hawaiian participation in the processes of translation did not translate into Hawaiian empowerment.

The translated Bible, and the laws of God it articulated, were the foundations of the eventual legal system, but because Hawaiʻi's circumstances meant that the laws had to be constantly translated, the practice itself was as influential as the Bible, if not more so. This chapter will first describe how the early laws were proclaimed, then identify who was writing and/or translating the laws, and in what languages. I will also address how the kingdom dealt

with the fact that it essentially had two sets of related but different laws and conclude with the kingdom's Supreme Court, and how one justice of the court embodies the fact that with the force of law behind it, translation could easily cause harmful ruptures.

Troubled early development of law

While I explained earlier that Hawaiians' kapu and kānāwai were similar to the succeeding concept of law, when I use that term from here on, I will be referring only to the development of codes and statutes in a Western style of law. This distinction also serves as a reminder not to accept easy translation. All too often we create easy equivalences in our minds, losing nuance and analytical edge, especially in a place like Hawai'i, where so many understandings of how history played out were and are being contested. The easy equivalency that comes from translation is seductive in that way, creating shorthands, and allowing you to say that two things that are very different are essentially the same. And that damaging equivalency is what would come to happen with the Hawaiian system of law.

As more Hawaiian ali'i and their followers were brought into the Christian fold, they began to want to reshape Hawaiian society to more closely fit the model of what their missionary teachers told them was civilized. The missionaries claimed to be taking a hands-off approach pushing specific laws. But at their 1823 annual meeting, as part of reviewing the previous year's accomplishments, setting the course for the upcoming year, and preparing the mission report for the ABCFM board back in the United States, they embraced and rejected an obligation to advise the Hawaiian lawmakers:

> In regard to the preparing and establishing a code of laws for the regulation and government of these Islands, the committee are of opinion that we ought not to be indifferent to the kind and nature of the laws about to be promulgated. . . . It will *doubtless* be the wish of the rulers of the nation to make their laws accord with and be founded upon the word and laws of God. Such being the case, it will

> be expected that we shall make known to them the laws of God, as well as the nature of those codes of laws that are adopted by Christian nations.
>
> [...]
>
> At the same time we are to leave entirely to the Rulers to adopt or reject such as they choose, *without our interference* or attempt to procure the adoption of any law or set of laws. [emphasis added] (40-41)

The apparent contradiction here is in fact nothing of the sort. Though vowing not to interfere with the aliʻi *choice* of laws, the missionaries commit themselves to making known "the laws of God" and the Christian-inspired laws of nations, which the aliʻi would then presumably be bound to follow. Of course, had this conversation taken place a decade later, the missionaries might have been less confident about the word "doubtless," but we will get to that.

In 1823, Liholiho and Kamāmalu made their ill-fated trip to London. While they were gone, Kaʻahumanu, the indomitable kuhina nui, was in charge—though some might argue that she was always in charge, whether the king was there or not. While individual aliʻi had been issuing laws here and there, and particularly in the ports, where sailors were known to be trouble (Kamakau *Aupuni* 38), the kuhina nui proclaimed the most laws and held the most sway: "'O kēia ka wā kānāwai nui, hana kīpapa ua kānāwai, kū koʻa ka hana paila" (Kamakau *Aupuni* 49) ['This was the time of a great many laws, so many they were tightly packed like paving stones, so many that they were heaped like piles of coral'].

As Kamana Beamer points out, there were many practical reasons for proclaiming laws, because

> law allowed a nation to stand as a theoretical equal in diplomatic negotiations with a country of superior military power. Law could set semiautonomous regulations within the defined boundaries of one's nation. Embracing the concept of law could also keep foreign powers from using their military strength to assume control over a "lawless" nation and population. For a nation without

> infantry, naval vessels, and steel, law was a tool that could be manipulated nonviolently to maintain effective control domestically while decreasing the likelihood of external intervention. (105)

The first government document printed was in fact a notice that seamen would be locked up in the fort if they disturbed the peace (Forbes *Vol 1* 388). Then, as now, laws were necessary to protect Hawai‘i and Hawaiians from visitors who felt that they could do whatever they wanted once they set foot in our islands. As Beamer also suggests, many of the Western trappings of “civilization” adopted by Hawaiians were strategic. Knowing that how they presented themselves on the international stage would heavily influence how other nations treated them, ali‘i and other kānaka wielding power chose to garb the lāhui in what other nations recognized as civilized and sovereign.

Law was a major example, and it is true that the more “pious” ali‘i passed laws intended to turn Hawai‘i into a Christian nation, feeling strongly that some of the population “needed the restraints of law to preserve them from the temptations to which they were exposed” (*Annual Report 1827* 78). The first laws were all based on the Judeo-Christian laws of God; there was even talk of granting the Ten Commandments the power of statute. The laws proclaimed by Ka‘ahumanu outlawed:

- murder
- robbery
- theft
- adultery
- prostitution
- polygamy
- worshipping idols, wood, stone, shark, spirits, ancestors
- worshipping any god other than Iēhova
- hula, oli, mele, swearing

- planting or drinking ʻawa
- making alcohol (Kamakau *Aupuni* 64).

Punishments included death for offenses such as murder, and lashings for prostitution. Penal colonies were established on Kahoʻolawe and Lānaʻi—Kahoʻolawe for men and Lānaʻi for women (Kamakau *Aupuni* 49). According to Kēhaulani Kauanui, “by 1827 and 1829 the major elements of Christian law were set in Hawaiian law” (*Paradoxes* 40%).

Because these laws were proclaimed orally by criers, and applied to all, including foreign sailors and merchants, translation was involved from the start. Historians of Hawaiian law such as William Westervelt and former territorial governor Walter Frear describe a relatively smooth and uninterrupted transition from kapu and kānāwai to law, recording little or no resistance to this Christianity-based approach. The only speedbumps mentioned were foreign challenges to particular laws, such as whaler riots over the banning of prostitution, or foreigner demands that they be allowed to determine their guilt or innocence themselves, such as British Consul Richard Charlton and the famous Cow Proclamation (Kuykendall *Vol I* 126) . But Hawaiian acceptance of these Christian laws was not universal. In fact, in 1829, the church only had 185 members—and 117 of them were admitted that year (Frear “Statute” 22). Admittedly, many of these were very influential aliʻi, but the mission was still on rather shaky ground. Kamana Beamer briefly describes some of the aliʻi resistance to these new laws and ideology:

> not all aliʻi were supportive of Christian ethics and many aliʻi openly challenged Kaʻahumanu and her Christian policies. Liholiho himself never converted to Christianity and once rebutted Hiram Bingham's pleas for him to follow the ways of the Christian God by saying, "I am God myself. What the hell! Get out of my house!"
>
> In ways similar to his brother, Kauikeaouli also rebelled against Christian ethics. Following the death of Kaʻahumanu in 1832, the nineteen year-old mōʻī reinstated aspects of Hawaiian traditional culture by taking an aikāne and

> considering a union with his sister. Even prior to Kaʻahumanu's death, her Christian policies were openly challenged by a faction of traditionalist aliʻi led by Kauikeaouli's kahu, Boki, and Liliha. Some even went as far as to call for the assassination of Kaʻahumanu: "E kaha i ka ʻōpū o Kaʻahumanu, a e ʻoki i ke poʻo"—let us slice her from end to end and remove her head (114)

I would also like to draw further attention to Kauikeaouli's actions, because ka wā iā Kaomi, the time of Kaomi, was an important disruption of the burgeoning dominion of Christianity and law, which as Kēhaulani Kauanui points out, "were central to the nineteenth-century Western civilizing process, where the bourgeois family was the model to be emulated" (*Paradoxes* 40%). Refusing to be treated as a salvable people, or be translated, and therefore enfolded and defined by these newly introduced Christian laws, those who participated in ka wā iā Kaomi were rejecting such figurations and models as irrelevant to Hawaiian ea.

Kaomi was the aikāne of Kauikeaouli. While we are still recovering the true depths of what aikāne relationships and connections entailed, to get a sense of what an aikāne is, one can think of someone of the same sex who is an intimate / favorite / friend / lover / partner / confidante / ally and more—sometimes all at the same time. In contemporary contexts and discussions, much is made of whether or not aikāne had sex with each other, but truthfully such pleasure was not the defining aspect of aikāne or most other traditional relationships because Hawaiians did not draw sharp lines between the intimacy of friends and of lovers. (Indeed, "hoʻāo," one of the words used for the Christian concept of marriage, really only refers to someone who stayed the night.) Not surprisingly, though, the missionaries, who had translated 1 Corinthians 7:2 "Aka, o moe kolohe auanei, ua pono no i kela kane i keia kane, kana wahine iho, a ua pono no i kela wahine i keia wahine, kana kane iho," as mandating that to avoid fornication, each man needed his own woman, and each woman her own man, considered anything that sounded like moe kolohe—something like "mischievous sleeping"—as horrifying and sinful. This is to say nothing of the "homosexuality, polyandry, polygyny, and chiefly

procreation among those within close degrees of consanguinity" that the missionaries found in Hawaiian society (Kauanui *Paradoxes* 36%). Aikāne relationships thus crossed that even sharper line, so whenever they could, the missionaries translated the world as "friend," stripping from it any of its Hawaiian cultural aspects. Clearly then, the missionaries would have agreed with Hawaiian scholar Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio, who in her work on recovering Hawaiian pilina and relationships, declares that "aikāne offers a first step into a world unmolested by toxic monogamy and heteropatriarchy" (78). The difference, of course, is that this step appalled and terrified the missionaries.

It should not then be surprising that a powerful early challenge to Western religion and law's figuration of Hawaiians as salvable people would arise from an aikāne relationship. Kauikeaouli, the young mōʻī, and his beloved aikāne Kaomi acted in stark contrast to the mission's teachings and the proclaimed laws against moe kolohe. Because of their aikāne pilina, Kauikeaouli elevated Kaomi to the title of "mōʻī kuʻi," something along the lines of joint paramount chief (Kamakau *Aupuni* 117), making them the two most powerful people in the kingdom. Moe, Kaomi's father from Borabora, was himself an aikāne of Kahekilikeʻeaumoku, the brother of Kaʻahumanu. Kaomi's mother was a Hawaiian named Kahuamoa (Kamakau *Aupuni* 117). A very bright young man, Kaomi was one of Hiram Bingham's first students after the mission arrived, and Kaʻahumanu installed him as a teacher of Christianity and literacy for her followers ("No ka Holo" 1). But because the missionaries remained suspicious of how authentically Hawaiians had converted to Christianity, Kaomi was refused baptism, and soon grew disillusioned ("Ka wa" 94).

Though Kaomi and Kauikeaouli were in overlapping circles, Kamakau said that it was Kaomi's healing abilities that brought him to the mōʻī's attention:

> he wahi ʻoihana akamai ma ka lapaʻau kāna wahi ʻoihana i makemake ai ka mōʻī.

> He wahi ʻike nāna[17] i ke ʻano o ka maʻi, a he wahi ʻike hāhā (Kamakau *Aupuni* 117)
>
> [ʻhis skill at healing is what brought him to the attention of the mōʻī. He had knowledge of the symptoms of disease and some understanding of diagnosing illness through touch']

He was also amusing and smart and a good storyteller, and in time, Kaomi and Kauikeaouli became aikāne. When Kauikeaouli made him mōʻī kuʻi, Kaomi could then distribute land, clothing, and money, and even draw upon the kingdom's budget (Kamakau *Aupuni* 117). He was indisputably the kingdom's most powerful aikāne, and his reach and influence show how woefully inadequate the mission's attempt was to refigure Kaomi and other aikāne by translating the term as "friend."

Kauikeaouli was 19 years old at this point, and the very powerful and driven aliʻi Kaʻahumanu has just died, so "early in March [1833] a crier was sent through the streets to proclaim the abrogation of all laws except those relating to theft and murder" (Kuykendall, *Vol I* 134). Ka wā iā Kaomi had begun on Oʻahu. It was not so much a rolling back of Western law as an assertion of the power of tradition not to be abrogated, diminished, or refigured through translation. When they learned about the changes in law, many foreigners were ecstatic, but the missionary establishment and Christian aliʻi were horrified. All the laws against "licentiousness" had been repealed. Two male lovers were running the kingdom. Rum, ʻawa, and ʻōkolehao were freely made and distributed. Hula and mele were performed again. Gambling ran rampant. People were again having sex with partners other than their spouses, and sometimes in groups. Schools were closed. While some islands maintained the laws, hundreds of people were flocking to Oʻahu, which had already been a site of continuing struggle over Calvinist reforms while Boki and Liliha ruled a few years earlier (Kauanui *Paradoxes* 49%), because "a

[17] Another reading of this word could be "nānā" rather than "nāna," creating a parallel structure between "nānā" (seeing/observing) and "hāhā" (feeling/touching) in terms of the way that Kaomi is able to diagnose and treat illness.

Kalaeokalāʻau a Kaʻieʻiewaho, waiho aku ke kānāwai" [ʻfrom Kalaeokalāʻau (most southwest point of Molokaʻi) to Kaʻieʻiewaho (the channel between Kauaʻi and Oʻahu), the law ends'] (Kamakau *Aupuni* 120).

Histories in English tend to represent ka wā iā Kaomi as an orgiastic explosion of lawlessness; Hawaiian-language accounts refer to it as a "haunaele," something like a riot or tumult or ruckus. But the length of time that it went on, and the thousands of Hawaiians who took part, some from other islands, suggest that it was more accurately a resurgence of previously suppressed activities that followed a freeing return to tradition. Though some perhaps simply wanted to have sex and drink when the opportunity arose, just as many, if not more, were expressing their discontent at their figuration as subjects under a Western law that criminalized Hawaiian values and practices in their lāhui, their aupuni. It is also important to note that the people were abandoning foreign law, not regulation itself. Though official kapu had been abrogated by the ʻai noa, the so-called free eating, after Kamehameha's death, individual practices were still governed by kapu that dictated performance, context, and transmission. So for instance, the return to hula and mele was not a rejection of regulation, but the choice of a preferred kind of regulation. It was an assertion of ea, and not just by the aliʻi who supported Kauikeaouli and Kaomi. The makaʻāinana involved were not Christians, bound by these laws; they were not salvable people, nor did they need or want salvation. Instead of letting the Bible and the law, with their refiguring translations, dictate what it meant to be a Hawaiian, they themselves determined what they as makaʻāinana could do.

Though ka wā iā Kaomi was just as much about the desires of Kauikeaouli, those unhappy with the rejection blamed Kaomi, and plotted against his life. Although Kauikeaouli put guards around him, and proclaimed that no one was to enter his compound on pain of death, an aliʻi named Kaikioʻewa captured Kaomi. As Kaikioʻewa prepared to execute the young mōʻī kuʻi, Kaomi's guards fetched Kauikeaouli, who emerged victorious from a fistfight with Kaikioʻewa (Kamakau *Aupuni* 121). In previous times, to have touched Kauikeaouli's sacred personage

would have been unthinkable, indicating that some shifts in tradition had already taken place. And even though ka wā iā Kaomi had been going on for months, tensions ratcheted down after this, perhaps because both sides feared the possibility of civil war. The mōʻī and the Christian chiefs largely reconciled, Kaomi fell out of favor, and within a decade, Kauikeaouli would give his people their first Western, American-style constitution. But with an important difference—he would no longer be following the dictates of such law, but authoring them.

Authors of the law

At around the age of 10, Kauikeaouli had ascended the throne with the promise that "he aupuni palapala koʻu" [ʻMine will be a nation of literacy/learning'] (Kamakau *Aupuni* 24). After ka wā iā Kaomi, and in response to continual problems in the 1830s with France, Britain, and the US over legal matters, he became more amenable to the advantages of a formal system of law, including staving off the consistent stream of colonial depredations. He decided that the best way to approach implementing such a system would be to have the aliʻi learn more about the options. As early as 1836, then, following the model of enlisting teachers of religion and other branches of useful knowledge, the mōʻī began looking for an American teacher to teach them the science of government, (Frear "Statute" 34). When none was forthcoming, in 1839, William Richards at the urging of the aliʻi left the mission to work for the kingdom. According to Richards, "I engaged to act as interpreter and translator in government business of a public nature when called to it, and was to receive for my services 600 dollars a year, to be paid in quarterly enstalments [sic], of 150 dollars each" ("Report" 66). But he had instructional responsibilities as well, for "As soon as the arrangements were completed, I commenced the compilation and translation of a work on political economy, following the general plan of Wayland, but consulting Lay, Newman and others, and translating considerable portions from the 1st mentioned work" ("Report" 66). He then delivered a series of lectures on the topic for the aliʻi (Frear "Statute" 34).

While the vast majority of the population spoke ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, English was already

becoming a prestige language spoken by a small but very influential number of people. For this and other reasons, translators played major roles in the inner workings of the kingdom, and by all accounts, in this capacity, Richards had a major impact on how Kauikeaouli and the other aliʻi came to understand law and governance:

> I ka heluhelu ʻana o nā aliʻi i ka buke kālaiʻāina, a hoʻomaopopo i ke ʻano o nā aupuni kumukānāwai a me nā aupuni kumukānāwai ʻole, a laila, maopopo ihola. ʻO ke aupuni kumukānāwai, ʻo ia ke aupuni kaulana ma ka honua, a ʻo ia nō hoʻi ke aupuni poʻokela o nā mōʻī, nā aliʻi a me nā makaʻāinana. ʻO ia nā aupuni ʻoi kelakela ma ka naʻauao a me ka waiwai, a ʻo ia nā aupuni i kanu ʻia i ka holomua, i ka ʻimi waiwai a me ke kālepa. A laila, ua ao kanaka aʻela ka manaʻo o nā aliʻi, eia kā ka pono, eia kā ka waiwai, eia kā ka hanohano. (Kamakau *Aupuni* 129)
>
> [ʻWhen the aliʻi read the book on political economy and began to understand the aspects of constitutional and non-constitutional governments, it all became clear. The constitutional government was the most celebrated governmental model in the world, and it was also the most outstanding for the mōʻī, the aliʻi, and the makaʻāinana. They are the governments that are superior in enlightenment and wealth, and the governments that are planted in progress, economic growth, and trade. So it came to the aliʻi, that here indeed was good, here indeed was wealth, here indeed was glory.ʼ]

Within a handful of months, Hawaiʻi had a Declaration of Rights and a Constitution. Promulgated at Luaʻehu, Lāhaina, it came to be known as the Luaʻehu Constitution. While the legal system drew heavily upon Anglo-American common law, the United States Constitution was the model for the 1840 Constitution—which took the form of a single document, rather than the amalgam of Parliamentary acts, common law, conventions, and treaties that made up the British "Constitution."

As Kamakau suggests, the aliʻi quickly grasped the advantages of becoming a constitutional nation, not just because it would shape how the aupuni governed itself, but also because of the hanohano, or the favorable impression, it would make upon other nations. As Hawaiian historian ʻUmi Perkins suggests, it would also show that the kingdom was progressive:

> Aside from the Magna Carta forced upon King John in the 13th century, the US Constitution is the first modern constitution. Considering the slowness of a process such as "constitutionalism," we should appreciate the fact that the Hawaiian Kingdom had a constitution only 50 years after the US – this is a very quick response to the trend of devolving power from monarchs to people, ideas and rules. ("Constitutionalism")

Perkins further asserts, albeit provisionally, that Hawaiʻi's 1840 constitution was only the fifth single-document constitution in the world ("1840"), and the "very quick response" set the pattern for how the lāhui Hawaiʻi would pick up on what it considered to be progressive, modern ideas and ways to run the government. In the Constitution of 1852, for instance, Article 12 outlawed slavery, further declaring, eleven years before Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, that any slave who made it to Hawaiʻi would be considered free. Since the kingdom did not have a history of slavery, abolishing it was not difficult in practical terms, but Article 12 shows that the mōʻī and aliʻi were not afraid to declare what kind of nation we were.

The drafting of the 1840 constitution also set the model for how later laws would be enacted. A brilliant young Lahainaluna student named Boaz Mahune was given the initial responsibility of writing the laws, but without much guidance (Frear "Statute" 36). Kauikeaouli merely directed him to make them conform to the principles of Political Economy that they had learned (Richards "Report" 67-68). Then the mōʻī and aliʻi discussed "what had been written for several hours a day for five days and then ordered particular rewrites; then they discussed them again, ordered more rewrites, and so on until they passed unanimously" (Frear "Statute" 36). When published in 1842, the compiled laws were credited to David Malo, John Papa ʻĪʻī, Boaz

Mahune, Timothy Keaweiwi, Daniel ʻĪʻī, and others (Thurston *Fundamental* vii). But as with the Constitution, the mōʻī, the kuhina nui, the House of Nobles, and the House of Representatives modified these laws.

Most significantly for our purposes, the English translation of the Constitution came with the following Translator's Note:

> the translation is not designed to be a perfectly literal one, but wherever there is a variation from the letter of the original it is always made with the design of giving the sense more clearly . . . . The original [Hawaiian] will *of course* be the basis of all judicial proceedings. [emphasis added]

The translator[18] is making it clear here that while liberties have been taken for the sake of clarity for those who cannot read the original, the translator can only exercise this freedom because "*of course*" the Hawaiian original, in the language spoken and written by the aliʻi and legislators, is the deciding version. What this chapter hinges on is that this understanding would soon come to change.

Who is writing these laws is crucially important. Though different from kapu and traditional kānāwai, this foreign legal system is not a foreign imposition. Hawaiians are setting down the laws in the Hawaiian language for Hawaiian purposes. Although specifically Christian laws were rejected during ka wā iā Kaomi, Kauikeaouli did not resist the Western mode of proclaiming laws that would benefit the lāhui. Things get complicated as time goes on, however, and Hawaiians seem to lose control over setting the laws. One contributing factor was that like the United States, the kingdom relied heavily on the British common law system, with its juries, separate jurisdictions of equity, and strong reliance on judicial precedent (Asensio 18). One judge's decisions could therefore ripple through the entire system of Hawaiian law, and some of the most consequential precedents rested upon which version of the law was the translation,

[18] Both Kuykendall (*Vol I* 168) and Thurston attribute the translation of the Constitution of 1840 to William Richards, though David Forbes says that this is a mistake and that Judd was the translator (*Vol 2* 318-319).

and which is “the original.” This uncertainty arose because while the model for drafting the laws still generally held—someone composed the text, then the mōʻī and legislature gave feedback—very soon Hawaiians were not doing the initial writing.

In 1844, a young American lawyer named John Ricord arrived in Hawaiʻi. As the only trained lawyer in the kingdom, he was persuaded to take up the post of Attorney General. He dove in and reorganized the government, setting out to make more comprehensive statutes while followed procedures established earlier:

> The compiler in obeying that resolution, has submitted at intervals portions of the succeeding code to His Majesty in cabinet council of his ministers, where they have first undergone discussion and careful amendment; they have next been transferred to the Rev. William Richards, for faithful translation into the native language, after which, as from a judiciary committee, they have been reported to the legislative council for criticism, discussion, amendment, adoption or rejection. The two houses have put them upon three several readings-debated them section by section with patience and critical care, altering and amending them in numerous essential respects, until finally passed in the form in which they now appear. (*Statute Laws 1845 and 1846* 7)

Ricord left the kingdom in 1847, but not before setting an important precedent—this “compiler” did his work in English, which was then translated into Hawaiian. Ricord also helped to recruit the 26-year-old William Little Lee, the second trained lawyer in the kingdom. Lee came with his fellow “adventurer” Charles R. Bishop to Hawaiʻi from America, in search of a better climate for the tuberculosis he had contracted the previous year (Dunn 60–61). Lee’s ascent was swift. In addition to becoming a judge and then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, he was appointed to the privy council, became president of the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles, and later elected to the Legislature, where he became Speaker of the House of Representatives (Dunn 61).

William Little Lee authored the 1847 Act to Organize the Judiciary Department, which mandated that the framers of kingdom law rely upon both common and civil law (McKean, Jr. 199), even though in practice, like its American and British models, Hawaiian law relied primarily on common law. He went on to write civil and criminal codes, and to serve as the primary author of the 1852 Constitution, which was reviewed by R. C. Wyllie for the cabinet and John Papa ʻĪʻī for the nobles (Osorio *Dismembering* 86). A Scotsman opposed to universal suffrage, Wyllie complained that this constitution was too republican, and felt strongly that the British constitution would make a better model for Hawaiʻi (Kuykendall *Hawaiian* 115-116). Lee himself believed that common law, rather than 'the ancient laws and usages of the kingdom'" could provide "'the foundation of a code best adapted to the present and approaching wants and condition of the nation" (Asensio 21-22). Had Lee relied more on civil law, more power would have stayed in the hands of the mainly Hawaiian legislature, because in civil law-dominated contexts, judges are constrained to apply only the statutes enacted by the legislative branch, whereas in common law judicial decisions and precedent play a much stronger part. This placed far more power over law in the hands of the judiciary, which, as we will see, was largely made up of foreigners.

Uneven Transference in the Shift to English

Once the constitution was ready, the House of Representatives offered a joint resolution to print 2,000 copies in Hawaiian and 500 in English (*Journal House 1851–1853* 287). The numbers speak to the proportions of language speakers. Hawaiian was by far the language in most common usage across the pae ʻāina, and despite the presence of 13 haoles among the 46 legislators, in government as well (Lydecker 35). But the fact remains that the number of haole legislators was far out of proportion to their actual percentage of the population, and that the laws must be printed in English at all suggests that the kingdom is at a transition point in terms of translation of the law. From the time the first laws were proclaimed, and especially after the first printed laws appeared, legal translation became increasingly necessary, and therefore

more and more institutionalized. In places more directly under colonial sway, such as South Africa, Canada, and parts of India, different sets of laws governed you if you were European, or one of the local subjects under foreign rule (Merry “Law” 132; Massoud 47). Geographical proximity of the islands and the unified state of the kingdom allowed Hawai‘i to enact one set of laws holding jurisdiction over everyone. But once the kingdom had laws, it needed translated laws, and translation became the hinge upon which the entire legal system swung. Every law had to be in Hawaiian and English—Hawaiian because it was the language of the people and the legislature, English because foreigners needed to be able to read the laws they were subject to, and because other nations could then see what kinds of laws Hawai‘i was passing, and therefore gauge the “progress” it was making. It is not coincidental that after Keauikeaouli voluntarily gave his people a constitution, international recognition through treaties soon followed.

The problems arose from the actual application of the laws. The government understandably rejected the colonial practice of establishing two different legal systems—one for the people, another for the occupying foreigners—as something no enlightened nation would do. But the inherently interpretive nature of translation meant there were still two related, but different, sets of law. The result was a lot of baggy logic, dedicated to the progressive cause of insisting that the Hawaiian and English versions of the laws were equal because one was the original and one was the translation. For this reason, translators, interpreters, and bilingual speakers became extremely important to the kingdom. Through to the overthrow, every session of the legislature deals with the hiring and replacing of good interpreters and translators, and in 1890, the salary of the Supreme Court’s interpreter was second only to those of the justices themselves (Asensio 16). One good example of the intellectual gymnastics and equivocation necessary to make laws in different languages seem equivalent is the tri-partite treaties the kingdom would sign, such as the one among Great Britain, France, and Hawai‘i in 1846 (Alexander “Uncompleted” 16). By definition it is difficult to impossible for any translation to

duplicate the original text, but in this case, a single translation must represent documents in two different languages.

The definitive example of the difficulties involved in insisting on the equivalence of the two sets of laws could well be Albert F. Judd's ruling in 1892. As Hawaiian lawyer and legal scholar Nāhoa Lucas notes:

> In a later decision, Chief Justice Albert F. Judd, writing for the Supreme Court, attempted to reconcile any discrepancies in the translation and interpretation of the dual laws holding that "the two versions constitute but one act. There is no dual legislation. As a rule, one version is the translation of the other. The effort is always made to have them exactly coincide, and the legal presumption is that they do." (4)

Though one language remains the "original," and thus binding, they are therefore somehow also exactly equivalent. This claim might seem to simplify matters legally, but a look at a few key terms immediately reveals the problems. Take for example the practice of having the word "kanaka" mean "man" in the Lua'ehu Constitution and subsequent statutes. A foreigner, and particularly an English-speaker, would understand "man" as something like a male human and beneficiary of the heteropatriarchal rights, privileges, and dominance laid out in the Bible and woven throughout the fabric of Western society. For a Hawaiian, however, "kanaka" refers to someone always junior to the land, and in relationships that require service. The Pukui and Elbert dictionary entry offers "subject, as of a chief; laborer, servant, helper; attendant or retainer in a family (often a term of affection or pride)," and while the English word "service" may conjure up images of drudgery and servitude, in Hawaiian, "kanaka" contains within it the conviction that no one can avoid the rights, responsibilities, duties, and kuleana of service—not even the ali'i, some of whom were said to be gods who walked the earth. Though generally seen as of higher status than kānaka, they too had to provide service to the land, and to the people as well. When the ali'i referred to someone who might be called a "servant" or a

"retainer" in English, they would most commonly call that person "ko'u kanaka" ['my kanaka'], and without going into linguistics too far, the o-class possessive in that construction (ko'u instead of ka'u) is used in a genealogical sense to refer to all of those in your generation and prior, while the a-class possessive refers to those generations yet to come. In that sense, kanaka are on a relatively concomitant level with the ali'i, not in terms of lineage, but implying a relationship of respect and trust, and a parity of sorts.

Furthermore, when kanaka referred to themselves when speaking to the ali'i—at the end of a piece of correspondence, for instance—they would often say something along the lines of "ka hunahuna lepo ma lalo o kou wāwae" ['the speck of dirt below your feet']. In English, this sounds like abject debasement. In Hawaiian, it acknowledges the reciprocal relationship between kanaka and kanaka, ali'i and kanaka, and kanaka, ali'i, and 'āina. When kānaka equate themselves with dirt, they are undeniably humbling themselves. But they are also drawing parallels between themselves and the land. With the dirt, they are the ground upon which the ali'i stands. They are what feeds the ali'i; and in the role of kanaka to the land, the ali'i must care for them, nurture them, and protect them. To be "kanaka" in a Hawaiian context does not give you much in the way of individual rights; it puts you in a web of reciprocal care and duty. Similar gaps in cultural understandings about rights and responsibility exist between many of the key legal and constitutional terms. Translating "mō'ī" as "king," for instance, dangerously parallels some classic colonial moves. As mentioned in the last chapter, translation made possible the claim that Paspehay, the *weroance* of the Algonquin-speaking peoples of the Virginia area, "sold" the lands of his people, even though the Indians did not believe in the individual ownership of land. Translating *weroance*, a term for tribal leaders, as "king" also "translated Paspehay into English property relations . . . so that the English can recognize him as having 'sold' 'his' land to the English, who following the 'legal' logic of their language can thus claim 'title' to this land (Cheyfitz 60). A single word turned communal land into personal property, which Paspehay could, and however unwittingly then did, alienate to the English.

Setting Shaky Precedent

Hawaiians knew that life and death are contained in one language; if anything, however, there is even more potential for life and death when shifting from one language to another. In the case of Hawai‘i, at first the linguistic gap between the two versions of the law was not too damaging. When the 1840 Constitution was promulgated, the translator wrote that “The original [Hawaiian] will *of course* be the basis of all judicial proceedings,” and that is indeed how things proceeded for several years because even if foreigners mistakenly thought Hawaiians or they themselves were “men,” the binding version of the law spoke of “kanaka,” and therefore “maka‘āinana,” in familiar/familial relationships with the ‘āina and the ali‘i, backed by generation upon generation of mo‘olelo and tradition and practice. When however the Hawaiian legislature declared in 1846 that all enacted laws needed to be published both in English and Hawaiian (Lucas 3), conflicts regularly arose between the two languages. At first the legislature tackled them on a case-by-case basis, enacting amendments as necessary (Asensio 22). But in the mid 1850s the courts began to weigh in, and the kingdom’s heavy reliance on common rather than civil law meant that precedents set by largely foreign judges had huge ramifications.

In 1856, came Metcalf v Kahai. The owner of a tract of kula land brought suit against his neighbor for wrongful detention and impounding of his cattle, which had wandered onto the adjoining land tract. There was however a clear disagreement between the English and the Hawaiian in the pertinent statute. The English states that the owner of the stray animals must pay “four times the amount of damage done, or of value destroyed.” The Hawaiian however would translate along the lines of the owner having to pay “a fair and reasonable amount of compensation for the loss and damage sustained” (1 Haw. 404). The plaintiff’s attorney argued successfully that the Court should be “guided by the provisions of the Hawaiian version,” and Associate Justice George Robertson agreed, writing that “Such, we believe, has been the practice of this Court hitherto, in such cases, and we conform to it in this instance” (1 Haw. 404).

A handful of months later, in Hardy v Ruggles, a very protracted case about mortgages,

Chief Justice Lee also determines that “in case of collision between the Hawaiian and English, the Hawaiian must prevail” (1 Haw. 461). Most discussions of this case generally stop here, because this is the part directly affecting language. I however will spend a bit more time on it, because in his decision, Lee discusses translation. Lee also contends that the Hawaiian phrase “na palapala hoolilo” translates into “all bills of sale and conveyances of personal property” rather than “absolute sales, transfers, or conveyances” (which would preclude mortgages), because this is the agreed-upon usage, confirmed by the fact that the same translation shows up in five separate places in this statute, and in all subsequent statutes (1 Haw. 461).

Lee’s discussion of translation here is interesting because it comes the closest to talking about how legal translation actually operates. As mentioned numerous times, there can be no true equivalence in translation, but as with the Bible translation, in order for the system to function, the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and English sets of laws must be understood and applied as if they were equivalent, and the way that that is done specifically for legal translation is through precedent and agreement. As Lee points out, “nā palapala ho‘olilo” refers to all bills of sale and conveyances of personal property because it appears on five other occasions where “all bills of sale and conveyances of personal property” would appear in the English. Legal translation is contingent, and particularly in contracts, conveyances, etc. where two parties are involved, each time the English would call for the usage of “appurtenances” and the Hawaiian used “nā mea e pili pono ana,” and both parties are happy with at least the way the terms of the contract are understood, the equivalence is strengthened.

This formulaic nature of law and conveyances is why legal document translation is one of the only kinds of translations that I believe that you can actually have a “right” translation and a “wrong” translation. Literary translations can miss certain aspects of the mo‘olelo, or focus on themes more tightly than the original, yet still do a decent job of representing a story. If however you translate “ko‘u ‘āina” as if it read “ka‘u ‘āina,” even though both mean "my land,” a lawyer would contact you immediately, because one means that you have the right to convey the land,

while the other doesn't. For this reason, Hawaiian legal document translation is paradoxically the easiest kind to do, because once familiar with what everyone agree the main concepts mean, the correct phrases can be substituted in and out. When for example "e ʻike auaneʻi nā kānaka a pau ma kēia, ʻo wau ʻo _____" appears, you can safely paste "know all people by these presents, that I am _____" virtually every single time without worrying that you are losing nuance or cultural references. Due to this contingent nature of legal translation, the Hawaiian versions of laws can convey all the necessary meaning required of them, no matter how complex the law or statute, and while certain issues of precision or scope may still arise, it is no different with English.

The crux of Hardy v Ruggles was that Justice Lee had to decide if the English word "pledge," when used in a legal sense, included the meaning of "mortgage." So in one of the cases setting initial precedent for the power that ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi had to express law, what Lee was ruminating upon was *English's* capacity to express law, and his understanding of legal translation as contingent is most likely why he is reaffirming the primacy of the Hawaiian version here. The problem came when someone with a very different understanding of translation addressed the issue of the controlling language in law. In Lee's Hardy v Ruggles decision, he quotes Judge Lorrin Andrews, a noted speaker of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, as asserting that the words "lilo" and "hoʻolilo" are "very broad and indefinite in their meaning," and therefore "capable of answering to a hundred different words in the English language" (1 Haw. 462). Andrews seems to be saying that since these words do not have exact English equivalents, they are difficult to translate. But of course, *most* Hawaiian words do not have exact equivalents, because as any translator knows, languages *do not* have exact equivalents in other languages. It is the nature of the beast. What began to change the legal realm in Hawaiʻi, however, was the fallacious but powerful expectation that each word in an English law *should* have a one-word equivalent in Hawaiian. And if it doesn't, as the barely competent Bible translators insisted over and over again, ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, not their own skill, is deficient.

In this instance, even though Lee seems to agree with Andrews, he still rules that:

> where there is a radical and irreconcilable difference between the English and Hawaiian, the latter must govern, because it is the language of the legislators of the country. This doctrine was first laid down by the Superior Court in 1848, and has been steadily adhered to ever since. The English and Hawaiian may often be used to help and explain each other where the meaning is obscure, or the contradiction slight (1 Haw. 463)

Though these rulings may have put Hawaiians at ease for a short time, they had long been worried about the growing foreign influence on the government. Ka wā iā Kaomi was among many things an expression of that concern, as were the many petitions and letters that maka‘āinana sent to their mō‘ī. As Jon Osorio explains:

> “In another petition from Lanai, said to have been signed by three hundred people, the Makaainana told the Moi that neither the size nor the wealth of the nation mattered as long as the nation was theirs:
>
> Below is what we desire
>
> 1. For the independence of the Hawaiian government
>
> 2. Refuse the foreigners appointed as ministers for the Hawaiian Government
>
> 3. We do not want foreigners sworn in as citizens for Hawaii. . .
>
> 7. Do not be afraid of our petition for you are our father.
>
> 8. Do not have any fear-because your Government is not very rich, of your own people.
>
> 9. We do not want you to open doors for the coming in of foreigners"
>
> (*Dismembering* 31)

This petition is representative in many ways, reaffirming the maka‘āinana’s aloha ‘āina and aloha mō‘ī, but clearly not trusting the haole. Certain events sharply increased this mistrust.

Over the clamoring of the people, "the legislature authorized haole voting and office holding in an act approved on 30 July 1850, three weeks after it permitted foreigners to purchase lands. Land ownership conferred the suffrage on male citizens and denizens alike" (Osorio *Dismembering* 63). Denizens were resident foreigners; this act granted them the same rights as Hawaiians without requiring them to renounce their citizenship to their home countries.

Other attempts to push for more legal authority for ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi failed, such as in 1852, when the House of Nobles turned down legislation preventing people without at least a passive command of Hawaiian from being appointed judges in the circuit and district courts (Asensio 15). The Nobles defended this action by claiming that "as persons possessing skill in the law, good character and knowledge of the language, were scarce to be found,—the House preferred a man who had the two former, to him who had the latter qualification alone" (qtd in Asensio 15). Legal knowledge is supposedly being valued over Hawaiian-language ability, but in fact, few foreigners had that qualification either. When he arrived in 1846, William Little Lee was only the second lawyer to take up residence in the kingdom, and the first one, John Ricord left a year later. So even though "he was not trained in law but was a graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary," missionary Lorrin Andrews became a judge (Silverman 56).

Like Andrews, George Morrison Robertson was another person who had no formal legal training either, but he too became a judge, and had a large effect on Hawaiian law and its translation. First coming to Hawaiʻi as an "okohola," a whaler, he worked as a clerk before leaving for the California Gold Rush. When he returned, he became a member of the Land Commission, and "i ka pau ana o kona noho ana ma ia oihana, ua hooikaika nui oia i ka heluhelu a me ka hoopaa i na Kanawai; a ma ia wa mai, he Loio kana oihana mau" ("Ka Make" 2) [ʻwhen he was done acting in that capacity, he put all of his efforts towards reading and memorizing the law, and from that time forward, he was a full-time lawyer']. Just as the missionaries arrived in Hawaiʻi with few language skills and proceeded to attempt to translate the Bible, so too did Robertson come with few legal skills and end up as a Supreme Court

Justice. Rather than formal legal training, clearly "the ability to read and write English and teach oneself common law would substitute [for] licenses and law degrees," as "Haole were assumed to know law without being requested to prove so by actually codifying and translating it in Hawaiian as Justice Lee did" (Asensio 40). A piece from the Hawaiian-language newspapers lays out this philosophy explicitly:

> Eia kona ano nui, "e koho no ke alii i kekahi haole i kakauolelo, a i unuhi olelo hoi, no ke aupuni." No ka pilikia o ke aupuni i na haole keia kanawai. Aole ike na ʻlii i ka olelo a na haole; aole hoi ike i ka lakou hana, a nolaila, keia kakauolelo. ("He Olelo")
>
> ['Here is the major reason why "the aliʻi should choose a haole to be secretary, and translator, for the government." This law is in regards to problems we are having with haole. The aliʻi do not know the words of the haole; they also do not understand their actions, therefore: this secretary.']

Since haoles presumably know more about haole things, such as law, than Hawaiians, the obvious solution is to hire a haole—a logic reminiscent of the ridiculous idea that "only a ninja can kill a ninja" so common in the movies I watched as a child.

This belief in the preternatural abilities of haole people to know haole things like the law also contributes to an idea that linguistic scholar Rubén Fernández Asensio calls a "genealogical axiom, i.e. the assumption that concepts, and especially legal ones, cannot be truly expressed and understood but in the language where they were first worded out" (27–28). Though Robertson is not solely responsible for the shift from the primacy of Hawaiian to the primacy of English in the law, he is a hinge. The reliance on common law and its reliance on judicial precedent meant that a single foreigner, like Robertson, could be instrumental in the formalization of those shifts, not just through his adherence to the common misunderstandings of language and translation captured in Asensio's genealogical axiom, but in his use of linguistic translation as well.

Robertson displayed his prejudices about language well before he became a judge. While a clerk in the Ministry of the Interior, he filed impeachment charges against Gerritt P. Judd, the Treasury Minister, for 16 supposed instances of misuse of his position, power, and public funds (Van Dyke 80). During the proceedings, the charges were read in English by R. C Wyllie, and in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi by Charles Gordon Hopkins. Judd asked which version would guide the commissioners, since there were slight differences (*Minutes Privy* 11). Robertson replied that he had sworn to the English version before the governor; the other was *merely a translation* [emphasis added] (*Minutes Privy* 13). After returning from the Gold Rush, as vice president of Land Commission in 1853 he was remembered for his efforts to keep the Kuleana Awards to makaʻāinana as small as he possibly could (Van Dyke 81). And while he would briefly uphold the primacy of the Hawaiian statute in 1856 with Metcalf v Kahai, Robertson would go on to sound the death knell for the primacy of Hawaiian in law during the last half of that decade.

Deciding on the Genealogical Axiom

Robertson's actions are directly related to his understanding of translation. After Justice Lee died in 1857, Robertson was the justice presiding over Haalelea v Montgomery, a case regarding whether exclusive fishing rights had been conveyed through the sale of a part of the ahupuaʻa of Honouliuli. The key phrase of the Hawaiian version of the deed reads "A me na mea paa a pau e waiho ana maluna iho, a me na mea e pili pono ana"; the English version, "And all the tenements and hereditaments situate thereon" (2 Haw. 68). Arguing that the words "a me na mea e pili pono ana" are "sufficiently broad in their signification to carry everything appurtenant to the land embraced in the conveyance," the defendants maintained that the Court should follow the Hawaiian version for two reasons. First, the grantor was a native, and a person of intelligence, and therefore had to be presumed to have intended to convey whatever would pass under the terms of the deed "as expressed in her own language." Second, the Court had decided in several previous cases that wherever an irreconcilable difference exists between

the two versions, the Hawaiian must govern (2 Haw. 68). The plaintiffs argued that the grantee, an Englishman, received the deed in both languages, and accepted the English version as the equivalent of the Hawaiian. He and those claiming under him should therefore be bound by the English version because the Hawaiian and English deeds are one instrument; if the languages are not identical (which the plaintiffs were not conceding), then the deed should be voided for uncertainty (2 Haw. 68).

In terms of the translation, what is at issue is whether or not the Hawaiian and English are equivalent. If they were considered to be so, as Justice Lee previously determined regarding Hawaiian and English versions of statutes, then the Hawaiian would continue to control because it has the necessary specificity and the contingent equivalency. This is what happened instead. Robertson acknowledged that "It is true this Court has repeatedly ruled, as stated by the defendant, that, in the case of an irreconcilable difference between the Hawaiian and English versions of a statute, the former shall control." He then however went on to assert that "it seems to us that the same considerations which constrained the Court so to decide in that case, do not exist in the present instance":

> The deed before us, with the exception of those parts of it which are descriptive, consists of a printed formula, in the two languages, which has been extensively used here, in dealings between natives and foreigners, since the enactment of laws requiring conveyances of real estate to be made in writing. The English version of this formula is, of course, the original, and the Hawaiian *merely a translation*. [emphasis added] (2 Haw. 68-69)

Whether the Hawaiian or English deed were drafted first is unclear, but it actually doesn't matter. What Robertson is claiming is that the "formula," or the understanding of law itself, is "of course" of English origin, and that Hawaiian is only an imprecise pathway to the meaning—"*merely a translation*," repeating what he had said as a plaintiff years earlier. He is therefore a devotee of Asensio's genealogical axiom: concepts, and especially legal ones, can only truly be

expressed and understood in the language where they were first worded out.

Examining the French, Latin, and other non-English roots of English common law as adopted in Hawai‘i is outside of the scope of this dissertation. Suffice it to say, however, that the genealogical axiom is a chauvinist approach, based on a misunderstanding of translation, legal and otherwise. But Robertson compounded his errors by going on to assert that the Hawaiian language was not fit to be the controlling language of law. “There do not exist in the Hawaiian language, two words which would exactly represent the two English words *tenements* and *hereditaments*” (2 Haw. 69), he declares, and while he does not explain why a one-to-one correspondence between words is an important criterion for translating one language into another, he is echoing Lorrin Andrews’s comments quoted above. He then argues that

> The exact legal signification of those terms could not be expressed in Hawaiian without great difficulty, and therefore words, which if used in some other connection, or under other circumstances, would convey a widely different meaning, have, when used in the printed formula of conveyance now before us, been accepted by the general consent of natives and foreigners using such formula, as meaning precisely the same things, and neither more or less than those two legal terms. (2 Haw. 69)

The problem here is not the argument. Echoing Justice Lee in Hardy v Ruggles, “The general consent of natives and foreigners using such formula” describes precisely the kind of contingent equivalency that should inform legal translation. But Robertson attributes the need for such equivalency to weaknesses inherent to the Hawaiian language:

> So far then as purely legal phraseology, or words of technical import, are concerned, it would seem to us both unsafe and unreasonable, to hold that the Hawaiian translation, and not the English original, should govern, when a question arises upon the construction of any part of the deed, where such legal or technical language is used. Such a course would unbar the door to endless

litigation and fraud, and involve our courts in a maze of uncertainty (2 Haw. 72)

Robertson's highlighting of "purely legal phraseology, or words of technical import" hearkens back to the missionaries' common complaint about the paucity of the Hawaiian language when translating the Bible. *There were just no words that could say what they needed to say.* Never mind that they all had a very shallow understanding of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, the problem must be with the language itself. Robertson is therefore simply joining in on the common refrain that Hawaiian could not be specific enough for sophisticated modern usage. Never mind that Hawaiian has a word for the small piles of detritus left outside of an octopus's den after it has eaten, or had hundreds of evocative names for specific winds and rains. Because Robertson couldn't find a one-for-one substitution for "hereditament," the language was clearly lacking.

Regardless of the order of composition, Robertson places the English version in the category of undying original. Since Robertson sees law as coming out of the English language, the English versions of laws/deeds/etc. are always the originals, and the Hawaiian versions are always translations. Despite Lee's pages-long foray into English legal dictionaries when trying to determine the meaning of "pledge," or Robertson's own use in this case of the Hawaiian phrase "Aole nae e hookomo ana i ka papa koa mawaho" to clarify the intent of the English (2 Haw. 67), he could only see English as having the necessary specificity to convey law accurately.

While many of Robertson's arguments duplicated the missionaries' (mis)understanding about ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, his "theory" of translation was also moving into even greater error, and the powerful precedents he was setting as a judge based on his "understanding" were moving the Hawaiian legal system away from its own translation principles. For all their grumbling, the missionaries believed that translation was capable of equivalent transfer. Because it was an article of faith that a translated Bible could convey the meaning of scripture found in its original languages, ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi could therefore grant you direct access to Christianity. When Hawaiians said, "Aloha ke Akua," they were speaking its language. By enshrining the genealogical axiom into law through his rulings, however, Robertson was declaring that laws in

ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi were merely paths to the English laws. This understanding led Robertson to make other very large changes. While to this point I have characterized his remarks on translation as a misunderstanding, there may be more deliberate dimensions to his institutionalization of the genealogical axiom because of how extensively it affects Hawaiian relations to land legally and culturally. To be blunt, he does this by deciding that *English* words will mean whatever he wants them to. For example, under the contingent agreements that govern legal translation, the word "hoaʻāina" was usually translated as "tenant." Robertson gets his desired result by redefining the English term:

> We understand the word tenant, as used in this connection, to have lost its ancient restricted meaning, and to be almost synonymous, at the present time, with the word occupant, or occupier, and that every person occupying lawfully, any part of "Honouliuli," is a tenant within the meaning of the law.

Another consequence of the genealogical axiom is that Hawaiian words can never be used in English versions of the law. Makaʻāinana and hoaʻāina are never allowed to just be "makaʻāinana" and "hoaʻāina" in legal contexts. They have to be translated into "citizens," and "tenants," and "occupants." If they had been left in Hawaiian in the English documents, not only would the Hawaiian-language versions very clearly been the controlling version, so too would the Hawaiian cultural understanding have been the controlling version. But as I will show in Chapter 5, then and now, this is a haole understanding of the world: unless you are Hawaiian, ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi exists only to translate from, ignoring the fact that Tahitians, Greeks, Spaniards, Chinese, and other peoples who lived here spoke ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi.

To return to hoaʻāina, although customary practice understood this word as referring to a particular connection to the land, Jon Osorio notes that with regard to the makaʻāinana, the Kuleana Act of a few years earlier had "called for the legal dissolution of their traditional status even to the point of changing their identity. Makaainana who applied for kuleana lands were renamed hoa aina (literally, friends of the land), which the law translated as tenants"

(*Dismembering* 53). Osorio further explores the consequences of the maka‘āinana’s forced transformation into hoa‘āina/tenants in the Kuleana Act:

> Its most enduring cost was the ending of an official recognition of the appurtenant rights of Maka‘āinana. On 6 August 1850, a legislative act set out rules defining and "guaranteeing" the hoa‘āina appurtenant rights to gather timber and thatch and secure water and rights of way. . . . Although it was still theoretically possible for each hoa‘āina to reach individual agreements with their landlords (whether they were the familiar konohiki or not), ultimately their rights, and only those rights, were to be secured not by tradition but by statute and judicial decision. (*Dismembering* 54)

Robertson’s retranslation of hoa‘āina => tenants => occupants also set the stage for severely limiting hoa‘āina/tenant rights in another high profile case of that same year: Oni v Meek. Oni was a hoa‘āina who pastured his horses on the kula land of Honouliuli as part of his traditional relationship with the konohiki of that area. When John Meek leased this kula land, he seized Oni’s grazing horses and sold them under the kingdom’s estray laws. Oni wanted to recover the value of his two horses, but he also wanted to confirm that he had the right to pasture his horses by custom or by statute. Robertson’s decision was as follows:

> For it is obvious to us that the custom contended for is so unreasonable, so uncertain, and so repugnant to the spirit of the present laws, that it ought not to be sustained by judicial authority. Further, it is perfectly clear that, if the plaintiff is a hoaaina, holding his land by virtue of a fee simple award from the Land Commission, he has no pretense for claiming a right of pasturage by custom, for so far as that right ever was customary, it was annexed to the holding of land by a far different tenure from that by which he now holds (2 Haw. 90)

Just as in Haalelea v Montgomery, when he changed hoa‘āina from “tenant” to “occupant” to abrogate any special rights Hawaiians might have to land, here Robertson is once more

redefining the hoa‘āina’s relationship to the ‘āina as without customary rights other than those specifically established by statute. Robertson contended that any rights that Oni and his fellow hoa‘āina had enjoyed on the konohiki’s land were due to the labor that they performed, rather than any customary or traditional relationship that maka‘āinana had with ‘āina and their ali‘i (2 Haw. 91).

Robertson’s genealogical axiom eroded the standing of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and Hawaiians under the law, and his legal decisions became precedents that accelerated this stripping of legal power. Not content with deciding so many cases against the primacy of Hawaiian language, however, in 1858 Robertson completed the draft of the civil code initiated by the late Justice Lee. During the last year of his life, Lee withdrew from two sessions of the court so that he and Robertson could work on this code (Silverman 61). Unsurprisingly, when section 1493 of the Hawaiian Civil Code was amended on May 17, 1859, the sentiment was entirely Robertson’s: “If at any time a radical and irreconcilable difference shall be found to exist between the English and Hawaiian versions of any part of this Code, *the English version shall be held binding*” [emphasis added].

Conclusion

In the aftermath of the Māhele and the Kuleana Act, Hawaiians had been translated again. In the first decades of the century, they were figured through translation as a salvable people. In the middle decades, they came to be figured as “tenants” and “occupants” of land. Even in their own laws, Hawaiians were no longer maka‘āinana, in relationships of mutual aloha with the ali‘i and the ‘āina. They were “citizens” who had “rights” rather than pono. Law was the realm in which this happened, and translation was the instrument. Robertson’s wish to make English the controlling language of the law set the stage for the further disenfranchisement of Hawaiians, and for the political upheaval at the century’s end. Hawaiians still held a majority in the legislature. Had the kingdom followed the path of Roman civil law rather than British

common law, the power would have remained there, with judges mandated to make decisions only in accordance with the statutes coming from the legislature, and judicial precedent carrying much less weight. And even if the kingdom had followed the British constitutional model more closely, the Hawaiian-led legislature would have retained much more power because in that British model, Parliament held sovereignty over the judicial. As implemented in Hawai‘i, however, the American model split power between the mō‘ī, the legislature, and the judiciary, with a strong reliance on common law granting greater latitude to the foreign-dominated judiciary to interpret the laws as they saw fit. For this systemic reason, even though Hawaiian lawmakers fought tooth and nail to pass legislation to mitigate or reverse the effects of Robinson's precedents and laws, introducing bills to change the controlling legal language back to ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i right up to the end of the kingdom, English remained the the standard.

Though a Hawaiian mō‘ī was still in charge, and the number of Hawaiian lawyers was rising, tracing the flow of legal translation reveals how and why Hawaiian political power was eroding. Hawaiians may not have started off with much knowledge of Western law, but the "very quick response" the kingdom made in adopting a constitution, and the succeeding progressive laws and institutions that it passed, suggests that Hawaiians picked it up very quickly indeed. In fact, something similar had already happened to the missionaries' gift of alphabetic literacy, which took root and spread in Hawai‘i far faster than they could have dreamed. But in both those arenas, once Hawaiians began to excel and threatened to take over the reins, the colonial structures represented by the missionaries and foreign judges moved the goalposts again and again, thanks to the genealogical axiom and people like Robertson. And in the next chapter, we will see how the missionary establishment responded predictably when Hawaiians sought to employ the means of literary production for themselves.

The first two chapters have tracked the translational flow. Who is doing the translation? For whom? And who controls the narrative? In the first chapter, though Hawaiians were essential to the process, they did not have control over the translation of the Bible or the

narrative around it, leading to their strategic erasure. In this second chapter, though control of translation in the legal realm is more contested, a reliance on common law and judicial precedent cuts Hawaiians out of the process once more. The third chapter will examine what happens when Hawaiians seek to exercise control over language through the newspapers, translating for themselves for purposes they deemed appropriate. Though this too is a contested zone, chapter three suggests how powerful a tool translation becomes when Hawaiians are the ones wielding it—and how dangerous the foreign residents find them.

CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATION IN THE WILD: TRANSLATION AS A TOOL FOR EA IN THE HAWAIIAN-LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS

"Mai, mai, mai!" Jonah called out to his 'ohana. It was Saturday, and the week's nūpepa was out.

He clapped the road dust off of his worn dungarees as he walked up the stairs and sat down on the bench in the center of the lānai. Even though it was January, the weather was hot, and it was muggy in the house. Jonah fanned himself with his hat, enjoying the respite from the sun.

Tūtū Anna came out of the house with a smile, and a gaggle of barefoot kids in an assortment of shorts and trousers and dresses made from old palaka shirts came belting around the side of the house. Tūtū Anna sat next to Jonah on the bench, her hand patting his knee, and nodded as he read aloud the news about the kaua nui ma Europa, and how the kula Bīhopa just had its annual hō'ike. Maile leaned up against a post and idly mended one of Jonah's work shirts to the comforting sound of his deep baritone.

The kids, ranged along the stairs with a few outliers fidgeting in the grass, had sat surprisingly still while Jonah continued to read aloud. But when he moved on to the shipping schedule, all the keiki groaned.

Kamalei, his little keko, called out, "E ku'u papa, i hea ana ka Nautilo?"

Jonah's brow creased and his eyebrows pulled down in mock anger. Kamalei's laugh tatted out of her, followed by all of the other children.

He knew what everyone was waiting for. Jonah skipped ahead to the last page and began to read: "He 20,000 legue ma lalo o ke kai. Nā mea kupanaha o ka moana…"

As noted in chapter one and numerous other sources, Hawaiian literacy rates skyrocketed with each succeeding decade of the nineteenth century. The eagerness with which the Hawaiians of that time appropriated alphabetic literacy, and to a lesser extent translation,

meant that they created a massive body of native-language writing, made up primarily of the Hawaiian-language newspapers. Historian Noelani Arista describes it as “arguably . . . the largest literature base of any native language in the Pacific and perhaps all native North America” (665). Literary scholar kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui observes that for Hawaiians then and now, it is “the largest and most accessible body of written material documenting Kanaka ʻŌiwi thought, tradition, and society” (22). If we take into account the relatively short amount of time between the introduction of alphabetic literacy and the end of the Hawaiian-language newspapers in 1948, the size of that archive is doubly impressive.

An example from North America shows both how powerfully subversive indigenous-language publishing can be, but also the lengths to which colonial powers will go to quash threats to their own power. The Cherokee people, like Hawaiians, achieved near total literacy in their own language after Sequoyah introduced his syllabary in 1821. They began translating the Bible around the same time as Hawaiʻi, and established a press that printed in the syllabary and published the *Cherokee Phoenix,* a Cherokee and English-language newspaper in 1828. Initially edited by Elias Boudinot, who like Thomas Hopu and the other Hawaiians, went to the Cornwall Foreign Mission School, this paper, appearing six years before the first Hawaiian-language newspaper, often included news about Hawaiʻi because the ABCFM had an influential Cherokee mission. But while the Cherokee nation was fighting legal battles against the state of Georgia for attempting to settle Cherokee land, the Georgia Guard destroyed the printing press for being subversive (“History of the Cherokee Phoenix”). Though not the end of Cherokee-language print literature, we see how swiftly colonizers feeling threatened will try to derail or destroy native-language archives.

Although Hawaiʻi’s distance from the continent and sovereign control of its own borders nourished the development of our large archive of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, efforts to suppress Hawaiian voices in the newspapers continued for several decades. While the structures of power in place, like the church and the judiciary system, made it very difficult for Hawaiians to maintain their ea

in these realms, the newspapers proved a different story. In a highly contested arena, once Hawaiians took control of a press, their nūpepa displayed high levels of technical and rhetorical skill. They also deployed translation as part of Hawaiian efforts to strengthen and cultivate their ea, culminating in the political unrest of the nineteenth century's last decade.

The nūpepa carried a lot of weight in terms of the roles they played as sites of contesting discourses, cultural perpetuators, mouthpieces of law, windows to the outside world, and communications channels for the large numbers of Hawaiians who went abroad. Speaking of the traditional mele and moʻolelo printed in the newspapers, Mary Kawena Pukui, the premier Kanaka scholar of the twentieth century, says:

> Hawaiians regarded the lore of their ancestors as sacred and guarded it jealously. Such subjects were not talked about lightly nor too freely. . . . There had to be quiet during story telling period so that the mind would not be distracted. Strict attention had to be paid to every word of the narrative. No unnecessary movement was permitted except to change the sitting position when uncomfortable. The call of nature must be attended to before the story telling [sic] began, for it was kapu to attend to such matters in the middle of a tale. Tales learned were not repeated casually without thinking to whom and where one spoke (1602)

With regard to how she learned moʻolelo, she reports "It didn't matter whether it was told interestingly, but it did matter that it be told correctly" (1603). But with all respect to Pukui, kā kākou kumu, tracking the Hawaiian-produced newspaper content reveals that for traditional and translated foreign moʻolelo, "interesting" does matter, as aesthetics, reading for pleasure, and presenting simple useful knowledge became primary concerns. Of course, the tellers/authors of moʻolelo often did have lessons for their audiences, and this chapter will show how important they were. But as early as the first mission papers, Hawaiians were becoming so adept in

alphabetic literacy and translation that their moʻolelo and writings were soon collectively representing a powerfully Hawaiian literary aesthetic.

Like other materials from the Mission press, such as the spelling primers and catechisms, the early newspapers had a heavily didactic approach. Often, however, they tried to add items of interest as well, much of it coming through translation—an article about a man in Lithuania who was 168 years old ("He Mau Elemakule" 2), for instance, or descriptions of other Polynesians ("No na kanaka" 21), letters to the editor, a surprising amount of information about elephants ("No ka Elepani" 3; "Ke Akamai o na Elepani" 19), travelogues ("Holo ana" 49), and woodcuts of scenes from Hawaiʻi and abroad, such as the girls' school in Wailuku ("Kula"). These newspapers piqued Hawaiians' interests, and kānaka Hawaiʻi were involved in the newspapers early on as writers and producers of content. Readers and writers alike soon saw the benefits of presenting ʻike and moʻolelo in published form. The early papers were still under editorial control of the mission, but as with many introduced technologies, Hawaiians paid attention to what they wanted, identifying the aspects of the technology or form that would advance Hawaiian values and interests. And as we will see, when letters to the mission and government press requesting different content or particular forms of moʻolelo proved unsuccessful, Hawaiians eventually published their own nūpepa that hewed more closely to the literary aesthetic that they had developed.

Of course, these Hawaiian-produced moʻolelo passed down important cultural information. But to view them as mere vessels of the oral tradition (Krug 102–103) is to under-estimate authors and translators who were pushing literary boundaries to form an aesthetic of Hawaiian literature. None of this contradicts Mary Kawena Pukui, but does suggest that different times and contexts affected how moʻolelo were shared—and especially as Hawaiians lost control of the press as the Territorial period unfolded. In itself, the noble intent of preserving and passing down cultural knowledge cannot explain the Hawaiian-language newspaper boom of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, particularly since the undeniable penetration of

Christian values into the Hawaiian psyche made a fair number of kānaka maoli feel that holding onto Native traditions was backwards and ignorant. Hawaiians latched onto alphabetic literacy at an amazing pace not only because it provided a pathway to knowledge and enlightenment, but also because of the aesthetic and entertainment value they found in the moʻolelo they read, whether the latest news (understood to be moʻolelo), or the history of the Kamehameha lineage, or the most recent adventures of the Lightning Detective.

While it was indisputably the missionaries who provided the framework for Hawaiians to pick up alphabetic literacy and a desire for reading, the ABCFM used similar models with other indigenous groups without achieving similar results. In Hawaiʻi, though, accounts and images of mākua or keiki reading the nūpepa aloud to the entire family, then passing it on to the next house, became so common that the publishers pleaded that each family buy its own copy so that the papers could stay in business, and in the twentieth century, kūpuna often recalled in interviews being responsible as children for reading aloud (Nogelmeier 81). In short, the Hawaiians' keen appetite for reading was largely due to themselves. Though skeptical at first, as outlined in chapter one, the aliʻi, and then the makaʻāinana, quickly saw the benefits of alphabetic literacy above and beyond what the missionaries offered. And there's the rub. Hawaiians became like thoroughbreds, needing an open track to run, but the missionaries and their editor allies wanted them to keep pulling plows.

While clearly contested spaces, only a few Hawaiians and missionaries took part in the Bible translation process, and only aliʻi, elected officials, and a handful of Lāhainaluna students wrote and translated the law. Once the newspapers took hold, however, the arena was open to all, as letters and moʻolelo from ʻelemakule and luahine from remote locations like Keʻei appeared next to editorials by the most well-known intellectuals in the kingdom. The nūpepa became a Hawaiian realm for learning, entertainment, grief, debate, and more. Translation played a big role as well, bringing news and moʻolelo into ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi from all over the world—primarily from English sources, but from French, German, Chinese, and other Pacific language

materials as well (*Kuokoa* 12 Jan 1867, 2; 12 Apr 1862, 1). But Hawaiians had to fight constantly to claim and reclaim this realm, because when the missionaries, and then their descendants and the sugar planters, recognized how much power the nūpepa could potentially grant, they did what they could to undermine Hawaiian agency in print.

As the first two chapters have argued, translation is never simply an unmarked process that carries something from one language to another, and in Hawaiian hands, it became a strategy for asserting the power of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, and by extension Hawaiian culture, to hold everything that the world had to offer. There is nothing that cannot be brought into Hawaiian. The Bible and legal translations addressed our afterlives and our bodies, but what about the life of the culture, the life of the lāhui? According to Bacchilega and Arista

> We will venture to make a generalization at this point: translation in Hawaiʻi's public sphere in the latter part of the nineteenth century served very different sociopolitical purposes depending on whether it was translation into or from Hawaiian. Hawaiians translated a wide variety of texts from English into Hawaiian for Hawaiian-language newspapers, taking a cosmopolitan approach to different narrative conventions and cultures, just as their King Kalākaua would be doing in the 1880s when upon returning from his world tour he brought novelties such as the telephone, the flush toilet, and electrical lights to ʻIolani Palace.
>
> This open-minded use of translation was a sign of confidence in the Hawaiian language and culture, and as such an inclusive practice; it was also a sign of acculturation into the settlers' worldview and cultural codes. (165)

I would like to lean on the last line of this quotation a bit. While the desire to translate foreign moʻolelo and news, and thus bring them into the Hawaiian realm, involved some degree of foreign acculturation, I would argue that especially in what was chosen as "worthy," translation often powerfully served distinctly Hawaiian purposes.

Translation gives mana to moʻolelo. A version of a story is called a mana; the word

refers to the way trees or streams or roads branch out and go in different directions. Mana is also the power that inheres in everything, and can be increased or lost through certain actions, often ritual in nature. What that means is that the more a moʻolelo is told, translations included, the more mana it has. Translation, then, is an act of consecration too. It takes time, effort, and skill, and only certain texts merit that outlay. But when Hawaiians translate foreign texts, ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi gets mana/consecration as well. Translating the news and the latest scientific developments shows how supple and nimble Hawaiian can be; translating what foreigners deem great works of literature shows how profound and nuanced Hawaiian can be. And after taking over the press, when the nūpepa place traditional mele and moʻolelo side-by-side with these translated texts, Hawaiians are not only declaring that we recognize and celebrate the greatness of *your* moʻolelo, but that *our* moʻolelo can measure up to, and often exceed them.

The next section tracks how Hawaiian-language newspapers and translation worked hand-in-hand to create a powerful and critical site for discourse with a Hawaiian audience in mind. After looking briefly at how newspapers developed, we will examine what happened when Hawaiians began using the presses for themselves, then identify the roles that the nūpepa and translation played in the nineteenth century's tumultuous final decades.

Early development of the Nūpepa

As far as printing went, until 1836, the missionaries were the only game in town (Kuykendall *Vol. I* 106), but even though the missionaries decided what was printed on the old Ramage press they carried around Cape Horn, Hawaiians were learning the mechanics of publication from the start. When their first printer Elisha Loomis left in 1827 for health reasons, Hiram Bingham took over, running the press with a journeyman printer and three Hawaiians: Richard Karaiaula, John Ii, and Kuaana (Ballou and Carter 33). By 1834, 12 Hawaiians were "employed most of the time in the Printing office and bindery" (*ABCFM Annual Meeting 1834* 47), developing a "commendable proficiency" (Kuykendall *Vol. I* 105). When the Honolulu

missionaries received a new press in 1831, they shipped the Ramage to Lāhainaluna, on Maui, and the Reverend Lorrin Andrews, who had been a compositor and pressman in Kentucky, began to teach his male students how to gather information, write it up, and print it (Chapin *Shaping* 16). Hawaiians grasped how to run a press even more quickly than they acquired literacy. Andrews himself admitted that he could not run the Ramage as well as the Hawaiian printer, who knew the business far better (Ballou and Carter 39–40).

On February 14, 1834, the 55th anniversary of the death of Captain Cook, the first Hawaiian-language newspaper, *Ka Lama Hawaii*, was launched (*Ka Lama* Feb 14, 1834 1). Its masthead declared "He mea ia e hoolaha ike, a he mea hoi e pono ai ke kulanui," something to disseminate knowledge and also something for the benefit of the high school. *Ka Lama* was just meant for the haumāna of Lāhainaluna, and it would feature, according to Lorrin Andrews:

> first Natural History with a plate, one piece & plate per week beginning with the largest animals. The cut to come on the first page as soon as size will admit. The description of the animal not generally to exceed two columns. The last page is for the scholars or for native genius. The remainder to moral & religious essays [and] news from different stations particularly whatever relates to schools on the islands, notes of foreign countries. &c. (Forbes *Vol. 2* 75)

Helen Chapin, one of the foremost authorities on Hawai'i newspaper history, describes *Ka Lama* as follows:

> The Reverend Andrews and his students printed 200 copies of each issue of Ka Lama and distributed them free. In half-sheet quartos, approximately nine by eleven inches in size . . . . *Ka Lama* also introduced the illustrated periodical . . . by reproducing prints made from wood blocks on a lithograph press. Dr. Alonzo Chapin, a physician posted to the mission, hand carved forty four-footed beasts like the lion, camel, zebra, buffalo, and reindeer, all of which except for the dog and horse were unknown to the Hawaiians. Explanatory text spoke to the

> "superiority" of American culture, the Christian religion, and the Protestant work ethic. . . . Accounts relate how, upon receiving their copies, students would immediately sit down and read them through. (*Shaping* 16)

Though a modern reader paging through the early mission papers might find them heavier on the "instruct" than the "delight" side, that their Hawaiian audience read them right away suggests that even early on, kānaka were attracted to the form as a means for disseminating ʻike and moʻolelo—though once they realized what they liked and didn't like, they demanded more of what they liked. A quick indicator of *Ka Lama*'s content and style, which set the tone for the missionary-run press for the next three decades, appears in the first article following the text explaining why *Ka Lama* was being printed, and who it was for. Entitled "Ke Kumu o ka Naaupo" [ʻThe Source of Ignorance'], the article begins with "O ka hewa ke kumu o ka naaupo" [ʻSin is the reason for ignorance'].

Probably the result of a mistranslation, a grammatically ambiguous but interesting statement in *Ka Lama*'s opening article anticipates what the newspapers will become. The editors say that the newspaper and other published materials are *for* "ka poe paahana, a na ka poe kalepa kekahi, na ka poe imi naauao kekahi, na ka poe haipule kekahi, a na ka poe kamalii kekahi" [ʻindustrious people, merchants, seekers of knowledge, religious people, and even children']. What makes this interesting is that the word used for *for*—"na"—more often means something akin to *by*. Though it will take a few decades to happen, the Hawaiian-language newspapers do become something *by* "industrious people, merchants, seekers of knowledge, religious people, and even children"—in short, the lāhui Hawaiʻi.

That newspapers do become the voice of the people in Hawaiʻi parallels events happening thousands of miles away in Britain, and to a lesser extent in the United States. Though there is little evidence of press suppression in Hawaiʻi during the earliest years—after all, the missionaries, with the support of the government, were in charge of printing—the fight for a free press was fierce in Britain. The Newspaper and Stamps Duty Act of 1819 put heavy taxes

on newspapers, making them so expensive to produce, and therefore to purchase, that the penny sheet *Medusa* referred to the Act as “A Bill to Prevent the Poor from Reading” (Wiener 3). Although print technology made it feasible to disseminate inexpensive newspapers and publications for working-class people, the government was not only afraid of the spread of radical ideals, but also of plain old general education, which could lead people to aspire above their station (Ashton 4). High duties on newspapers and a liberal use of the Blasphemous and Seditious Libel Act of 1819 kept most radical journalists in check until the early 1830s (Wiener 3), when printers began publishing cheap, and therefore illegal papers—the often radical “unstamped.” A similar history, with a similar rationale, will surface in Hawai‘i in the 1860s in response to the perceived threat of the nūpepa aloha ‘āina.

In the British milieu of economic and political repression, religious and secular societies like the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) and the Society for Disseminating Useful Knowledge (SDUK) came to the fore, devoted to making safe knowledge cheaply available in print to a wide readership (Brake and Demoor 565). Since universal school education was not yet established, Henry Brougham, one of the founders of the SDUK, declared, "The people themselves must be the great agents in accomplishing the work of their own instruction" (Schroeder 680). To this end, the SDUK produced affordable publications for their Library of Useful Knowledge; they later established another Library of Entertaining Knowledge (Ashton 6–7). As for the older and more pious SPCK, it produced its own range of cheap material. Its *Saturday Magazine* competed with the SDUK’s *Penny Magazine*, and a monthly miscellany, *Dawn of Day* (Brake and Demoor 565–66).

The main conflict was between those attempting to produce political papers for the general public, and the government, bent on achieving the twin goals of more tax revenue—over one million pounds per year in the early 1830s from the Stamp Tax (Wasson 83)—and ensuring that the working classes did not rise above their station. The resulting “War of the Unstamped” took place between 1830 and 1836, when *Ka Lama* and *Ke Kumu* are also being

published in Hawai‘i. This struggle resulted in hundreds of illegal periodicals, and the arrest and imprisonment of more than seven hundred vendors, publishers, and printers, largely politically radical (Wiener 2). Only twenty years later were the duties abolished in full.

A parallel SDUK had been founded in Virginia, the ABCFM had worldwide reach, and papers of all sorts arrived continually in Hawai‘i, so the missionaries and Hawaiian readers who could read English would be familiar with these competing cheap publications directed at a general readership. The contents of the Hawaiian language newspapers, however, suggest that the missionaries were paying closest attention to religious content distributed by the SPCK, and the secular material disseminated by the SDUK. They were clearly rivals. SPCK's *Saturday Magazine* had a circulation of 80,000, but the SDUK's *Penny Magazine* settled in at 100,000 (Adams 12) after a high of 200,000 (Brake and Demoor 565). The very first Hawaiian-language newspaper drew its inspiration from both. Though claiming to be for everyone, *Ka Lama* was printed by and for the haumāna of Lahainaluna. Only 25 issues appeared, featuring primarily religious and devotional materials, often translated from English-language texts, with additional moralizing sometimes added. But its editor, Lorrin Andrews, was aware of how SDUK general knowledge publications were popping up in Britain and the United States, and in 1834, he warned against an overreliance on religious material in *Ka Lama*, and in education more generally:

> If the missionaries really wish to lay a broad and deep foundation upon which the future welfare of the islands may rest, we wish to give stability to this kingdom, and the churches we are now planting; to build up and perpetuate those institutions, which are the glory of all [l]ands; if to do this, we are persuaded that literature and religion, *as means*, should go hand in hand; that knowledge should expand the mind and religion purify the heart. (qtd in Charlot 28)

He asks the rhetorical question, "Have we complied in the best manner we were able with the real wants of the nation, by preaching to them so much, and teaching them so little?" (qtd in

Charlot 28), and goes on to argue that a "just proportion" needed to be established between the teaching of religion and of literature. For the most part, though, his pleas fell on deaf ears, and the religion-heavy "preaching" tone of the mission and government-sponsored papers would continue, with little literary or entertaining content providing variety or balance, until Hawaiians were fed up.

A second general circulation mission paper, *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, appeared the same year (Forbes *Vol. 2* 79). Lorrin Andrews, perhaps unsurprisingly, was no longer the editor, having been replaced by Reuben Tinker. At their annual meeting, the ABCFM missionaries reaffirmed their belief in the inseparability of proselytizing and the press:

> To promote the cause of Christianity and civilization most advantageously in any country, and to secure to any people the early, ultimate and permanent advantages of moral reform, intellectual improvement and national prosperity, the pulpit and the press and a legitimate exercise of their powers are indispensable. (*Annual Meeting 1834* 82)

Besides alliteration, "the pulpit and the press" hearkens back to the goal of publishing salvation, and speaks to the need of uniting the SPCK's, the SDUK's, and the more popular publications' approaches: "the periodical press may be advantageously employed . . . to exhibit truth in an attractive form before the eyes of several thousand readers" (*Annual Meeting 1834* 83).

As it did in Britain and the United States, the "attractive form" caught on with the public, as Hawaiian readers fell in love with the very idea of nūpepa. Just as the Lahainaluna students' delight in reading their own language caused them to sit down immediately and read *Ka Lama*, the initial excitement of having "news" to read fueled people's interest through the first handful of newspapers. But these nūpepa were hardly responsive to the interests of the ever-growing and voracious Hawaiian reading public. Even offerings meant to be entertaining and literary, such as hymns, information about famous Biblical cities, and children's scripture stories, displayed a pervasive moral tone, and did not appear as regularly as readers desired. In a similar vein to

Andrews, because he felt that the ABCFM held too tight a rein on its content, Tinker resigned the editorship of *Ke Kumu* in protest, and left the mission soon after (Chapin *Shaping* 17). Chapin identifies these two papers as the first members of "the establishment press—establishment in that even though they spoke for just a handful of people and not for the vast majority of the native population, in just a few years they had come to exert a dominant influence on the Islands" (*Shaping* 16).

Though a few English-language newspapers began appearing around this time—and the first, the *Sandwich Island Gazette*, was actually very anti-missionary (Forbes *Vol. 2* 142–143)—their readerships were small, and Hawaiians did not take to them. So for the next few decades, Hawaiians read the papers of the mission press, whose content Helen Chapin describes as follows:

> Lead articles in *Ka Lama* and *Ke Kumu* discussed the rights and responsibilities of Native Hawaiian leaders in Western terms, along with the desirability of an American-style government, and promoted the Declaration of Rights in 1839 and a Constitution in 1840. (*Shaping* 17)

Kanaka political historian Noenoe Silva continues in the same vein as Chapin, observing that:

> For forty years missionaries controlled the power of the printed word in Hawai‘i. The missionaries used this power not just to save souls but to assist in the progress of plantation/colonial capitalism, to control public education, to mold government into Western forms and to control it, and to domesticate Kanaka women. (*Aloha* 55)

It is undeniable that literacy spawned an industry in Hawai‘i. Sheldon Dibble reported that at the mission press's height, "four printing-presses and two binderies are in constant operation, except when stopped for want of funds, employing about 40 native young men in both departments, who execute their work well with very little superintendence" (115). But the content

was generally more of the same, and eventually tiring of rewarmed fare, in the 1860s, Hawaiians, at least some of them, responded with *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*.

A Press of their Own: Dueling Voices

In 1855, Alexander Liholiho came to the throne. A man of broad tastes, he could speak some French and Spanish (Kuykendall *Vol II* 34), and it was said that “aohe mea i oi ae me ia ke akamai pau pono i na mea a pau o ka olelo Beretania, a me ka olelo Hawaii” [‘there is no one who exceeds the completeness of his mastery of English and Hawaiian’] (“Na Mea Hou” 18 Oct 1862 2). As very young men, he and his brother Lot had traveled with Gerrit P. Judd across the United States and Europe. Encountering overt racism in the US, but a kind and respectful reception in Britain, the brothers understandably came to be pro-British in their leanings (Chapin *Shaping* 42). Drawing upon his mastery of English and Hawaiian, Alexander Liholiho translated the Book of Common Prayer (“Na Mea Hou” 18 Oct 1862 2) and invited the Anglican Church to establish itself in Hawai‘i as a check against the growing influence of the ABCFM’s missionaries, many of whom had migrated into government positions.

Noenoe Silva describes succinctly the political power dynamics at the time:

> In King Kamehameha III's later years, after two decades of resistance, the missionaries were allowed to become a relatively uncontested moral force that enjoyed influence over the government. They had engineered the māhele and the political structure of the newly formed kingdom, and they had moved into positions of power in the cabinet and privy council. But Kamehameha IV (Alexander Liholiho) and his brother Ke Kamāli‘i Lota Kapuāiwa, a member of the House of Nobles and minister of the interior (who would reign later as Kamehameha V), constituted a new force in politics that did not accept or appreciate that the Calvinist missionaries' ideas alone should reign. (*Aloha* 46)

Literacy was high enough by mid-century that when literacy and property qualifications were proposed for voting, delegates to the constitutional convention for what became the Constitution of 1864 fought every proposed property qualification (even as low as $25), yet passed virtually uncontested the literacy qualification (Kuykendall *Vol II* 132). Many of these highly literate Hawaiians shared their mōʻī's opinion that Calvinist missionary ideas should not reign, and the resulting actions started what became Hawaiʻi's first major print war.

Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika

As Bacchilega and Arista point out: "settlers and Hawaiians struggled for competing systems of governance, land development, language, and culture" in what would become a "hotly contested public sphere" (163). But the contest did not begin until Hawaiians stepped into the ring in 1861. Before then, Hawaiian-language publications were a rather amiable mix of missionary and government-backed periodicals, although foreigners like Abraham Fornander and Henry Sheldon were stirring things up in the English-language papers (Chapin *Shaping* 41). Though the mission and government papers had generally seemed similar to the models of the SDUK and the SPCK in that they pushed for individual learning as a way of self-improvement, what they hadn't pushed for was Hawaiians taking over the press as a way of lāhui-improvement. As Silva says, the pivot came when "in 1861, to the shock and outrage of the missionary establishment, a group of Kānaka Maoli, makaʻāinana, and aliʻi together, transformed themselves into speaking subjects proud of their Kanaka ways of life and traditions and unafraid to rebel. Their medium was a Hawaiian-language newspaper called *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* (The star of the Pacific)" (*Aloha* 55).

The great nineteenth century newspaper advocate and scholar Joseph Kānepuʻu described the people who started this paper as "he poe no ia i uluhua i kahi manao haiki a laula ole o ka "Hae Hawaii," he nupepa Aupuni ma o Limaikaika la, na Mr. J. Fuller ka hooponopono" [ʻpeople who had been fed up with the narrow-mindedness and lack of breadth of *Ka Hae*

Hawaii, a government newspaper established by Richard Armstrong, and edited by Mr. J. Fuller'] ("Ahe" 1). Readers had petitioned *Ka Hae* to increase its size and its offerings of foreign and island news, mele, legends, and letters (Silva *Aloha* 56), but nothing came of it, so they formed a hui to create a newspaper of their own.

Kānepuʻu names Haleʻole, Keolanui, Komoikehuehu, Bila ʻAuwana, Kapahi, J. W. H. Kau[w]ahi, Kahalewai, Pualewa, Kalākaua, Kaunamano, Pinehasa, S. K. Kuapuʻu, Simon K. Kaʻai, and J. Moanauli as members of this hui, though some of them did split off to help Henry Whitney establish *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*'s rival *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* ("Ahe!" 1). J. W. H. Kauwahi, who authored the first book written and published by a Hawaiian (on how to write legal documents), was named as the overall editor of *Ka Hoku*, though the haole G. W. Mila, who had translated *Robinson Crusoe* into Hawaiian for *Ka Hae Hawaii* the year before (Kānepuʻu "Ka Mokupuni" 3), was also an editor, brought on specifically for his translation ability, since a great proportion of desirable material in Hawaiian-language newspapers came from translation (Chapin *Guide* 44). As for David Kalākaua, his contributions to the paper earned him the sobriquet "editor King" when he ascended the throne (Forbes *Vol 3* 294). In *Hoku*'s first issue, the editors make their position clear:

> No na makahiki he kanaha i hala ae nei, aole o kakou he nupepa nui a kulike hoi me ka makemake o ka lahui Hawaii, kahi i hiki ai ia kakou ke hookomo i ko kakou mau manao ponoi, nolaila, aole i loheia na mea akamai me na na [sic] mea lealea, a ko kakou manao i hookupu ai, ua waiho keia mau mea ma ka papa, me ka manao ole ua loaa ia kakou kekahi wahi naauao iki, a ua nele loa kakou i ka nupepa ole e hoihoi ai, a ua hoka loa ka makemake o ka poe maa i na manao maikai no kahi ole e hiki ai ia lakou ke hoolaha ae i na manao o lakou. . . . a ua hooholo . . . he pono no e hookumu i kekahi nupepa hou nui o ke kino, i hooponoponoia e na kanaka Hawaii, a malaila auanei e lawa ko kakou makemake

> ['For the past forty years, we have not had a newspaper that answered the desires of the Hawaiian people, a place where we can let our thoughts be known, meaning that none of the learned and joyful things that our minds have come up with have been heard. These things have all been discarded upon the floor, without thinking that we have even the tiniest bit of knowledge to contribute. We are lesser without such a newspaper to hold our interest, and those people who are used to intelligent thought are left frustrated because they have no place to express their ideas. So we decided that it was a must to establish a new large-format newspaper, edited by Hawaiians, and it would be there that our desires would be met.']

Helen Chapin praises this accomplishment, saying "it was a remarkable achievement that within three short decades of acquiring literacy and newspaper technology Native Hawaiians set up and controlled their own press" (*Shaping* 59), yet a particular segment of the public at that time did not agree.

Even before their first official issue went to press, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* had raised the ire of the missionaries and those who clung most closely to their beliefs. Under any circumstances, these opponents would have been apprehensive about Hawaiians taking the press into their own hands, but a mele published in a non-numbered preview issue had the missionaries frothing at the mouth. The resulting uproar had to do with translation. The piece was titled "He Mele Aloha i ka Naauao" ['A Mele of Love for Enlightenment'], and a scathing letter to *Ka Hae Hawaii* signed by "Punimaʻemaʻe" (Favoring Chastity/Cleanliness/Purity/Order) blasted *Ka Hoku* for publishing it. Punimaʻemaʻe claimed the new newspaper was not only full of "na olelo pelapela, lapuwale, he mea hoohaumia i ka naau o ke kanaka" ['indecent language, worthless, something that will desecrate the heart of a person'] but had also printed "na mele pelapela, haumia i haku ia e kanaka moekolohe no ko lakou mau wahine hookamakama!" ['filthy, degraded mele that had been written by adulterers for their whores!'] ("E ka Hae" 102).

According to Punimaʻemaʻe, even if you try to hide the filth within a mele by calling it a mele aloha [ʻmele of love/alohaʼ] for something, “E hoopalahinu wale no oe ia waho o ka hale kupapau, aole nae e nalo ka pilau oloko, a malaila e ike ia ai oia he kupapau” [ʻYou are merely polishing the outside of a crypt; the odor from inside shall not be banished, and that is how you will know that it is a corpseʼ] (“E ka Hae” 103). With this mele’s publication in mind, Punimaʻemaʻe condemned *Ka Hoku* as a “makua nana e hanai i ko Hawaii poe keiki i ka apu awaawa o ka make” [ʻa parent that is feeding Hawaiʻi’s keiki the bitter poison of deathʼ] (“E ka Hae” 102).

What made this attack a translation issue was that the editors and supporters of *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* were convinced that Punimaʻemaʻe was haole—a missionary or a descendant, perhaps—and did not have the skills to understand the meaning of the mele. After reprinting Punimaʻemaʻe’s letter, the editors looked at the mele involved, searching for any indecent language, and found nothing. Therefore “ina ua loaa i ka mea nana i kakau ka mea i oleloia maluna (he haole no ia) i kekahi olelo maemae ole, na kona naau kuko no i hookupu mai ai ia mea ana i olelo ai he pelapela” [ʻif the person who wrote the words printed above (they are clearly haole) found an unclean word, it was their own lustful heart that made what was said seem undecentʼ] (“No loko” 2).

In a letter to *Hoku*, someone writing under the name Puninūpepa, or Favoring Newspapers, responded:

> Puni Nūpepa argued that no newspaper is perfect, and even the Bible is not free of words such as “adultery.” He then challenged Puni Maʻamaʻe further: “Ina he haole oe e Punimaemae, e hoohalike kaua i ka hale kupapau, aole nae aʻu i ike he hale kupapau ulaula kekahi, koʻu ike he hale kupapau keokeo” (If you are haole, let us compare our tombs, I have never seen a brown tomb, what I have seen is a white tomb). Puni Nūpepa thus dared Puni Maʻemaʻe to reveal himself

> as a haole, and implied that if death were resulting from anyone's actions, it was from the haole, not from the Kanaka. (Silva *Aloha* 65)

Even two decades later, when Joseph Kānepu'u looks back on the creation of *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, he recalls Punima'ema'e and says: "ma ka manao ia, ke ola nei no ia kanaka, a he haole no nae" ['it is thought that this person is still living, and is a haole.] ("Ahe!" 1).

No extant copies of the *Hoku* preview issue have been found, so we cannot look at the mele, and Punima'ema'e did not quote the specific lines that were supposedly indecent, as the *Hoku* staff duly noted. But the comments from staff and readers alike suggest that they felt Punima'ema'e's translation abilities were too meager to understand the mele's mana'o Hawai'i fully—itself evidence why a newspaper run by Hawaiians without being filtered through a haole lens was essential.

Punima'ema'e was not however the only one objecting. Outrage spread through mission churches, and reports began surfacing that those who subscribed to *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* would be expelled (Nailiili 2). *The Polynesian,* then edited by Abraham Fornander, an ally of Hawaiians who puni nūpepa, reported on the public scourging of *Hoku*:

> To judge from the contents of the *Hoku o ka Pakipika*, the greatest opposition which the editors and managers of that journal experience, comes from the Protestant Missionaries, who, it would seem, use every endeavor to crush the *Hoku* and stop its circulation among their church members and others, whom they hope to influence, alleging that it is a wicked, vulgar and scurrilous sheet. . . . The sympathy of the natives is gathering strongly on the side of the Hoku in spite of clerical tabus, threats and admonitions, and the spirit of the conflict seems to be one of mental emancipation from a sway that was cheerfully submitted to when discreetly used, but against which even Hawaiians revolt when iterfering [sic] with the liberty of speech or opinion. (*Polynesian* 23 Nov 1861 2)

Knowing that some Hawaiians are bilingual and will read his writing, Fornander here is not only showing his support for *Ka Hoku*, but also providing a translation of sorts of that newspaper for English-only readers potentially sympathetic to its cause, since many foreigners did not side with the mission. Fornander then cuts to the heart of the issue: "The truth is, that there is a mental revolution going on among the native population, which the Missionaries are equally incompetent to comprehend, to master or to avert, and of which evidently the *Hoku o ka Pakipika*, (the people's journal), is more properly the result, rather than the cause."
Though many opposed to *Hoku* continued to focus on the paper's "obscenity," its editors and readers, along with a few English-language newspapermen like Fornander, understood that the issue was more about the threatening power of Hawaiians finding their own voice than any sort of obscenity.

Hawaiians were even more sanguine about what they were up against, speaking to the opposition they were facing as something located within the missionary establishment but also within what would later come to be understood as deep-seated racism. In a letter published in *Hoku* about the opposition they were facing, J. W. H. Kauwahi formally addresses his compatriots:

> Aloha ino kuu mau makamaka; kuu mau hanauna o ke kupuna hookahi; kuu mau hoa o ka hoino like ia, a me ka mahalo like ia, kuu mau hoa ili hoowahawaha hookahi ia e ka poe a oukou e hilinai nui nei. (Kauwahi "No ka Hoku" 3)
> ['Alas, my dear friends, my beloved generations who have come from the same ancestor, my comrades who have been collectively reviled and praised, *my friends whose skin has been reviled by the very people we are supposed to trust the most*'] [emphasis added]

Language like this suggests that the relational ties connecting Hawaiians to the missionaries were fraying. While many remained under the sway of the mission, Hawaiians like the ones publishing *Hoku* clearly wanted to step out from their teachers' shadows, write their own

mo‘olelo, and translate material that they themselves found appealing to Hawaiian tastes and purposes.

Hoku’s supporters also explicitly decried the hypocrisy of the mission and their descendants—a charge that became a well-worn critique over the next three decades:

> o ka poe nae i keu aku o ka hoino, oia ka poe nana i lawe mai ka naauao ia kakou, a oia naauao ka kakou e hana nei e like me ke akamai a lakou i ao mai ai. Makehewa maoli ka lakou lawe ana mai e haawi mai ia kakou i ka ike a me ke akamai, a oia ike a me ia akamai ka makou i hana iho ai, a e lilo ka ia ike a me ia akamai i mea enemi no lakou. (“No ka Hoku” 2)
>
> [‘those who are the most abusive, they are the very ones who brought knowledge/enlightenment to us, and it is that enlightenment that we are using now through the skills that they taught us. It’s truly unfair that they would give us this knowledge and these skills, and those same knowledge and skills are what we are using, and yet they have now become anathema to them.’]

The editors of *Hoku* continue their trenchant analysis of the treatment they are receiving from the missionary establishment, also pointing to the paternalism of those who still believed they knew what is best for Hawaiians:

> He kanaha makahiki i hala mai ka hoomaka ana mai o keia lahuikanaka e aoia, a e ike i ka palapala a me na mea naauao o keia noho ana, mamuli o ke ao ana a na misionari Amerika; a hiki i keia makahiki, ua kanaka makua na keiki, ua kani moopuna, a nolaila ke kukulu nei a ke hoolaha nei i Nupepa no lakou iho, e hoonaauao i ko lakou lahui; ua pau ka noho ana ma lalo o na makua oia na Kumu, a ua oo hoi, ua paa ka manao, e hoonaauao aku i na makamaka. Aka, ke keakea mai nei na makua, me he mea la e olelo ana, aole oukou i hiki i na makahiki e oo ai, na makou no ia hana, a ma ia ano, ke hoohuli ia nei i kekahi mau keiki. (*Hoku* 3 Oct 1861 2)

> ['It has been forty years since our lāhui was first taught to know literacy and the enlightened things of this age through the instruction of the American missionaries; until this year when the children have reached adulthood, been blessed with grandchildren, and have therefore decided to establish and distribute a newspaper for themselves, to enlighten their own people. Their living under the sway of their parents, the teachers, has come to an end; they have reached maturity, made up their minds that their friends should receive knowledge. Yet the parents are blocking the way, as if they are saying that you have not yet reached maturity, this work only belongs to us, and in that manner, we have been turned back into children.']

Many of the first generation of missionaries had by this time passed away; others, such as Hiram Bingham, Artemas Bishop, and Lorrin Andrews were elderly, and had even left the islands. Later company missionaries such as Amos Starr Cooke were still around, and in positions of power, but by the 1860s, the children and grandchildren were taking up the mission torch, which they would grasp for the rest of the century. In short, those missionaries the editors of *Hoku* call mākua did not ultimately step aside for their Hawaiian "children," and missionary descendants such as Sanford B. Dole and Lorrin Thurston established the Reform Party, often called the Missionary Party, which was pivotal in the usurpation of Hawaiian governmental power, and therefore the political power of individual Hawaiians.

Though the editors here are using the images of parents and children metaphorically, the generation of Hawaiians coming of age was also among the first for whom alphabetic literacy, and to a lesser extent bilinguality, were simply a part of their lives. In 1861, Joseph Nāwahī and John E. Bush are 19 years old, and their future mōʻī Liliʻuokalani is 23. Literacy is something that was always around them, a tool that they have always had at hand, not something that had been absent until the missionaries brought it. For them and their generations and those that follow, literacy is a Hawaiian practice, and once the newspapers

begin, so is translation. That is why the idea of Hawaiians taking over the press is so threatening to the missionary party. The milk can't be unspilt, even though the Reform party, the Provisional Government, and the Republic in turn would try their best to bottle up Hawaiian voices and put the cap back on.

Though the critiques from *Hoku* editors and readers refer to trying to start a Hawaiian-led newspaper, they invoke the ideological, and sometimes the literal battle between Hawaiians and the tenets of Western, and specifically American, civilization. Hawaiians made good faith efforts to learn written language, law, governance, and religion because they can see the value of these things for ensuring the security and prosperity of the lāhui. And thanks to those efforts, they excelled. In unprecedentedly short amounts of time, Hawaiians achieved near universal literacy, created their own constitution and laws, and set up a government modeled on the values and principles they were told were the hallmarks of justice and fairness. And yet, whenever the haole/missionary establishment felt that Hawaiians were attempting to acquire too much power, everything they had been taught to "civilize" them went out the window.[19] Upon *Hoku*'s publication, Hawaiians were critiqued from the pulpit and decried as evil. As we have also seen, when Hawaiians began gaining a powerful familiarity with the law, the genealogical axiom and a predominantly foreign judiciary put an end to that. And when in the 1890s the government tried to re-establish its powers through legitimate mechanisms and precedents, US troops landed and the Queen was overthrown. Yet even with these forces in play, the *Hoku* editors stood strong and resilient, reassuring the lāhui

> Mai hopohopo oukou e na kanaka Hawaii, o ko kakou pepa keia; na na keiki papa o keia paeaina i kukulu ai; no laila e puili mai kakou e like me ka puili ana o ke kowali i ke kano o ka laau, a e hookahua maoli i kona ola mau iwaena o keia lahui. (26 Sep 1861 2)

[19] Historian Ron Williams, Jr. tracks this trend in relation to the Hawaiian Evangelical Association and the struggle over/through Native Christianity in his dissertation *Claiming Christianity: The Struggle over God and Nation in Hawai'i: 1880-1900*.

['Do not fear, O Hawaiian people, this is our paper. The native-born children of this archipelago are the ones who built it; so let us hold fast, just as the kowali vine wraps around the trunk of a tree, and let us set a strong foundation for its life here in our lāhui']

Despite or because of the early controversy surrounding its birth, *Hoku* only lasted for a little less than two years. For all their cleverness or ideological maneuvering, what made the nūpepa vibrant yet vulnerable was their status as businesses. And that meant attracting not just subscribers, but advertisers. Because the mission/plantation interests were the business elites, *Hoku* not surprisingly had a hard time finding advertisers, even after placing notices in such English-language papers as *The Polynesian* offering the availability of advertising space and free translation into Hawaiian ("Advertise" 1). And yet, although it would not enjoy a long run of its own, *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika* laid a firm foundation in the lāhui, planting the seeds and providing the inspiration for the vibrant Hawaiian-language newspaper public sphere to come.

Ka Nupepa Kuokoa

Ka Nupepa Kuokoa was essentially started when publisher Henry Whitney was unable to take control of *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika.* Kānepu'u and the others had arranged for the government press to print *Hoku* but then Whitney offered to rent them his press. But his prices kept rising, so Kānepu'u mā decided to stay with the government press. Then Whitney offered to take on all the printing expenses if they would dissolve their 'ahahui and give him control (Silva *Aloha* 68). That was hardly acceptable, so the 'ahahui stayed with its plans to print *Ka Hoku* at the government press—although some members joined up with Whitney instead to produce *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. A missionary descendant and longtime newspaperman, Whitney had established the English-language *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* in 1856 (Hori). By 1858, Whitney was doing all of the mission's printing, and in 1859, he bought the press for $1,300.

Though its influence did not wane, the mission press therefore officially ended in that year (Ballou and Carter 44).

Whitney may have called his new publication *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* [‘The Independent Newspaper’], but he placed it firmly in the tradition of the mission-run Hawaiian-language newspapers. The objectives announced in the first issue on October 1, 1861 could have appeared in *Ka Hae* or *Ke Kumu*:

> Alua. E hoolaha ia ana na manao haole o kela aina o keia aina; ke ano o ko lakou noho ana, hana ana, ao ana, ikaika ana, kuonoono ana, ia mea ae, ia mea ae, i hiki ai i kanaka ke ike ia mau mea, a e lilo ai i poe like me na mea naauao.
>
> Akolu. E hoolahaia hoi na oihana mahiai pono, a e hoike i na mea paahana maikai e hiki ai ke mahi e like me na haole naauao. E paipai hoi keia pepa i na hana me ka molowa ole.
>
> [...]
>
> O ka manao nui ma keia pepa, ka hoolaha aku i na mea hoonaauao a pau i ku i ke kanaka pono ke ike maopopo, i hoolikeia’i ko lakou noho ana me ko na haole.
>
> [‘Second. The haole ideas of each and every land will be spread; how they live, work, teach, grow strong, reach prosperity, and so on, so that Hawaiians can see these things and become like the enlightened peoples.
>
> Third. Proper agricultural techniques will be shared, so that the industrious ones can farm like knowledgeable haole. This paper will also encourage work without laziness.
>
> [...]
>
> The main idea of this paper is to make known all the enlightened things so that the pono Hawaiian can see clearly and so that their lives resemble those of the haole.’]

Though it can be argued that *Kuokoa* was less devoted to propagating and celebrating the gospel, its SPUK features were intact. As *Ka Lama Hawaii* had done seventeen years before (14 Mar 1834), the first issue featured a block print of a camel with accompanying "entertaining" text.

Predictably, those accusing the Hawaiian-run *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* of poisoning the youth of the lāhui saw the Whitney-published *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* as their champion. A letter from *Hoku* translated in *The Polynesian* quoted Rev. W. P. Alexander as saying "*The Star of the Pacific*, it is on the side of pleasure; it is for the Devil." The recipient of the letter, who had been asked to act as newspaper agent on Maui for *Hoku*, was urged to tell people to take *Kuokoa* instead (19 Oct 1861 2). Congregations in Kona were told not subscribe to *Hoku*, "for it was a great sin in a church-member to do so" and one teacher lobbied for a regulation that any member or officer who subscribed to *Hoku* should be declared a bad member, kicked out of church, and refused forgiveness for sins ("Ecclesiastical" 2). Even prominent Hawaiians, such as John Papa ʻĪʻī, a keeper of traditional moʻolelo himself, came down on the side of *Kuokoa*:

> Some discussion arose, in which the Hon. John Ii took a conspicuous part, and according to him "the evils which afflicted the country most and stood in greatest need of legislative revision, were the law of the 24th of August to mitigate the evils arising from prostitution," and who would have thought it! the Hawaiian newspaper, the "Hoku o ka Pakipika." The first he stigmatised as a disgrace to the country and the age, the latter was the sum and essence of all iniquity. (*Polynesian* 16 Nov 1861 2)

So deep was the church's hate of *Hoku* that just reading it was apparently enough to send you to everlasting damnation or brand you as "evil" as if you had been engaging in prostitution.

Though Whitney's relationships with the planter and business class went up and down, *Kuokoa* became the longest-running Hawaiian newspaper, going for seven decades. Whitney was a canny businessman and knew that it was not necessarily the creed of a paper that

ensured its longevity; rather, it was how many advertisers they could get to buy space (His other paper was actually called *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser*). Pro-American through its entire run, the paper also lobbied for the "advancement" of the lāhui, though what that meant often reinforced its US-friendly stance. And Whitney could recognize talent. *Kuokoa* had some fantastic editors throughout its seventy year run, including Simeon Nawaa, who was actually born on a missionary ship in the Marshalls and acquired a vast knowledge of moʻolelo and language (Hori), and Joseph Kawainui, later editor of *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, whom Kānepuʻu called a "kanaka Hawaii kuokoa" [ʻan independent Hawaiian'] ("Ahe!" 1). Like Joseph Poepoe, some of these editors ended up editing nationalist papers, and despite its own avowed goal of making Hawaiians more like haoles, *Kuokoa* printed a good bit of content about traditional practices, moʻolelo, and mele, including huge series by John Papa ʻĪʻī and Samuel Kamakau (Chapin *Shaping* 56–57).

But being the longest running Hawaiian-language newspaper did not mean *Kuokoa* was the most influential or widely read. Helen Chapin notes that during some of the most tumultuous times of the kingdom, including the aftermath of the overthrow, it just limped by:

> *Kuokoa* once enjoyed a circulation of perhaps 5,000 but had lost readers who no longer were willing to overlook its pro-Americanism, or as John Sheldon [also known as Kahikina Kelekona], editor of the nationalist *Holomua*, expressed it, *Kuokoa* had to be "given away free" to Islanders who used it to start morning cooking fires. (*Shaping* 93)

Even though *Kuokoa* was avowedly and proudly establishment, as Chapin has called *Kuokoa*, there is much to be gained from perusing its pages. Recognizable and relatively inoffensive to the establishment, *Kuokoa* undeniably attracted business.

Evolving Models of Translation in the Nūpepa

The first two chapters dealt with institutional translation—by the church and the government. Translation in the nūpepa, however, is essentially literary translation in the wild. I am using "literary" here to distinguish translation of written works from the type used in everyday contexts, such as business transactions. I am therefore calling many works "literary" that might not necessarily be considered "literature" by some—religious tracts and news articles, for instance. Translation was the driving engine for scriptural and legal texts; in the newspapers, translation was one of a number of tools used to speak to other Hawaiians. Though ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi was spoken by people of all ethnicities and national origins in the kingdom, the nūpepa's main audience was Hawaiians. For them, translation was a means for informing themselves about Hawaiian and foreign knowledge, for granting Hawaiians a voice in the print world, and for entertaining themselves.

Translation was essential to the day-to-day operations of the newspapers. Foreign news was translated from foreign newspapers or other trustworthy sources coming through the port. Translations of foreign fiction and non-fiction, ranging from histories and classic literature to bodice-rippers and pulpy detective stories, were printed next to Hawaiian moʻolelo. Laws, proclamations, and treaties with other countries were translated, and by law, government notices appeared in Hawaiian and English. Even the advertisements were often translations. The newspapers critiqued each other's translations as well. The editors of *Hoku* called out *Kuokoa* for a shoddy translation of an article from the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* ("Unuhi Olelo" 2), and *Kuokoa*'s pages hosted a several months long heated debate kicked off by someone named G. M. Koha that involved several challenges back and forth regarding translations of various passages from Latin, Greek, and Hebrew into Hawaiian and sometimes vice versa (Piliole 3).

As the papers got larger and the type more tightly packed, the challenge of filling the columns only increased. Some pieces no doubt were carefully chosen for translation because of

the effect they would have on the reading public. It is just as likely, however, that others were chosen because they supplied those last two column inches needed for an issue to go to press. This is one of many reasons why the nūpepa are so interesting to study. Since translation was practiced by every newspaper, and editors had to develop their own methods of selection and execution, a systematic survey of the translated foreign moʻolelo, involving assessments of themes and possible reasons for publication at particular moments, would yield amazing insights into the Hawaiian editorial mind. Why for instance was Robert Hoapili Baker's translation of the life of Stonewall Jackson published on July 13, 1876 in *Ka Lahui Hawaii*? What light do the multiple translations of Tarzan stories in the 20th century shed on the colonial imagination? Though such a study is outside of the scope of this dissertation, here I will focus briefly on three instances that reveal something about how translation is working in the nūpepa.

A Lesson in Translation

As part of Whitney's efforts to help Hawaiians make their lives like those of the haole, he published several translated European fairy tales. Since these tales frequently offered explicit lessons about morality and behavior—women shouldn't be curious, for instance—it should not be surprising that Whitney was drawn to them. Kawena Johnson lists 14 stories published in the first year of *Kuokoa*'s publication (204–205); the entire run of fairy and folk tales included "Snow White," "Beauty and the Beast," "The Frog Prince," and more. Charles Perrault's "Bluebeard" is my focus. I have written about this translation at length elsewhere; here the subject will be the powerful effects of moving even a loaded tale meant to "civilize" and "enlighten" Hawaiians into ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi.

Translation is still most often understood as a "lossy" transfer. "Lost in translation" is an oft-repeated aphorism. And in a way it is true; throughout this analysis we have been talking about how translation is not a process of complete transfer, that it is an interpretation and a reauthoring, and one part of that is meaning that was in the source text but for some reason did

not make it into the translation. In Hawaiian academic and community discussions, we often focus on this aspect of loss as well. Larry Kimura, one of the pioneers of the Hawaiian language revitalization movement, lays out this "lost in translation" understanding pretty clearly:

> English is a vehicle of its own culture and . . . English words carry their own connotations and history. Whenever Hawaiian is translated into English, the English words used add cultural connotations to the idea conveyed, while eliminating intended connotations and meanings of the original Hawaiian. (182)

He also goes into further detail about why this imperfect correlation between languages is troublesome for all involved:

> descriptions of the indigenous Hawaiian aesthetic culture and base culture through the medium of the imposed English language cannot absolutely transmit a full picture of Hawaiian culture. English inevitably implies Anglo-American culture in direct proportion to the part of Hawaiian culture that is lost in the description. This has a negative impact on Hawaiians, not only in the impression gained by outsiders, but also in the self-impression gained by English-speaking Hawaiians using such descriptions. (184)

But there are also a multitude of other planes that come into play besides loss: gain, shifting, re-emphasizing, reframing, obscuring, reinvigorating, among them.

This focus on loss alone is why many contemporary Hawaiians are so leery of translation. It undergirds the familiar history of the practice, which we will examine more closely in the next chapter. But as articulated by Larry Kimura, this paradigm refers solely to those extractive translation practices moving from Hawaiian to English, carried out largely for the benefit of mainly non-Hawaiian scholars. A somewhat different legacy and understanding of translation emerges, however, when we consider translation of the Bible into Hawaiian, or the back and forth between Hawaiian and English in legal translation, or most pertinent for our discussions here, the results when Hawaiians chose to translate mo‘olelo for other Hawaiians.

For when you invert Kimura's model, translating into Hawaiian represents a cultural *gain*. To recast his remarks, because the medium of the *Hawaiian* language cannot absolutely transmit a full picture of *Anglo-American* culture, it follows that *ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi* inevitably implies *Hawaiian* culture in direct proportion to what of *Anglo-American* culture is lost. As a result, these foreign moʻolelo are drawn into a Hawaiian understanding and worldview, as the added connotations from the chosen Hawaiian words shift the foreign mores and values closer to ʻāina, ea, lāhui, kanaka, ʻohana—all things we hold dear. Bringing something into the Hawaiian language does not of course automatically make it culturally Hawaiian, but it does—and sometimes deliberately—bring it into our sphere of influence. So when a nūpepa like *Kuokoa*, committed to pushing Hawaiians toward making their lives more like those of the haole, publishes a fairy tale like "Bluebeard" within a year of first issue, the editors may intend the story to entertain and delight, to teach women to restrain their curiosity (Tatar *Secrets* 3), and to communicate valuable lessons about "civilized" behavior. But through the act of translating into Hawaiian this account of a brutal male serial killer, complete with its misogynistic moral, some of its supposed "enlightening" content shifts.

On June 14, 1862, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* published "Umiumi Uliuli," a version of Charles Perrault's "Bluebeard." Known only as J. W., the translator was responsible for versions of a handful of other fairy tales.[20] Because it does not follow the French original, it was likely translated from an English-language chapbook—probably the one republished in the 1889 edition of *Amusing Prose Chap-Books, Chiefly of the Last Century*, edited by Robert Hays Cunningham, since the translation follows this version closely. For those unfamiliar with the story, here is a summary. A woman falls in love with a rich man with a blue beard. When they are married, he gives her the keys to every room in his house, saying that she may go into any room except one. He then goes off on a business trip. Left to her own devices, she gets bored

[20] For a discussion of J. W.'s translation of "Snow White," see Niklaus Schweizer's "Kahaunani: 'Snow White' in Hawaiian: A Study in Acculturation."

and looks around the house, finally ending up in the forbidden room, where she finds the remains of all his murdered previous wives. Freaking out, she drops the key in their blood, which will not come off. The man of course returns soon after, sees the blood on the key, knows she has gone into the room, becomes enraged, and prepares to kill her. She asks for time to pray, and he agrees. She then calls out to her sister to keep an eye out for her brothers, who are supposed to arrive that day. The man gets angrier and angrier. He calls out to his wife, but she delays until her brothers arrive in the nick of time and kill him.

In the original French, Perrault simply identifies the key as "fée" or "enchanted." In the English chapbook, the key is "a Fairy, who was Blue Beard's friend." In the Hawaiian version, however, the key has "mana" and is an "aikane" of ʻUmiʻumi Uliuli's. As mentioned earlier, mana refers to a branch or version of a moʻolelo, but it is also a power that inheres in people, places, and objects. J. W. could have used a few other words for magic/enchanted, but "mana" probably would have come to mind first. But mana is not magic. No uncanny supernatural/unnatural force, it is very much *of* the world. Everyone has mana, though in varying degrees. Neither separate or outside, it is something that we feel and witness every day. Describing the key as having "mana" also ties it to ʻāina, kānaka, even the kini akua, the pantheon of Hawaiian gods. In the Bible, mana's connection to the kini akua is reinforced because the Christian God must be referred to as the "Akua mana loa"—often translated as "Almighty God," but also meaning the god with the most mana. Though Christianity clearly has a powerful foothold at this time, many Hawaiians have not given up the kini akua, and almost a hundred years later, in a 1951 interview with Flora and Homer Hayes for the Bishop Museum, my own kupuna Lui Pānui talks about reading the Bible and then going outside to find the akua Pele at his house. Though he refers to her as an aliʻi rather than an akua, he still observes certain kapu when approaching her. The key's mana therefore brings it into the realm of a traditional Hawaiian understanding. This does not mean that readers thought the key was an akua or a Hawaiian cultural object;

rather, the associations readers would make upon reading about the mana of the key would be with the kini akua and non-Christian understandings of mana.

The English word “friend” in the chapbook version is probably what J. W. was trying to get across with “aikāne,” since the mission and polite society had for some time been trying to equate the two terms. Why? Because missionaries and their descendants raised on a steady diet of heteropatriarchy and Eve-coming-from-the-iwi‘ao‘ao-of-Adam (“iwi‘ao‘ao” even became a colloquialism for wife during the nineteenth century) were horrified by what an aikāne actually was. As Hawaiian scholar Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio describes them, aikāne are “intimate pilina” (79). Aikāne relationships appear most often in mo‘olelo, though as we saw in Chapter 2, ali‘i including Kauikeaouli had very public aikāne relationships well into the nineteenth century. Aikāne are in a very intimate relationship/friendship with someone of the same sex—often a sexual relationship, but based first and foremost on the ‘upena of intimacies that Osorio discusses, with the sex arising out of that closeness, rather than being required. Although I have never encountered a Hawaiian story in which a human, or a demi-god, took an object as an aikāne, by using that word for the key, the translator unavoidably brings to the Hawaiian reader’s mind the “intimate pilina” of aikāne relationships, rather than the bowdlerized “friend” that the mission was pushing for. Through translation, then, the magical aspects of the story that make it a “fairy” tale end up invoking a traditional Hawaiian worldview.

Even the wife’s much-critiqued (at least at that time) curiosity is transformed in the translation. In *The Hard Facts of the Grimms’ Fairy Tales*, Maria Tatar writes that “Nearly every nineteenth-century printed version of ‘Bluebeard’ singles out the heroine’s curiosity as an especially undesirable trait” (158). But in those places where the wife’s reckless and insatiable curiosity is often condemned, the Hawaiian version uses such phrases and words as “e kaunui ana kona manao e ike i na mea oloko o ka lumi,” ‘her thoughts were greatly set upon seeing what was in the room’ and “makemake loa” ‘greatly desired or wanted.’ In this version, the

woman makes up her mind to look in the room not because of some innate curiosity that will prove her downfall, but because she decided she would.

When this decision undeniably gets her into trouble, she calls out to her sister Anne (or ʻAne in the Hawaiian), who also appears somewhat differently due to the shift into a Hawaiian cultural context. As ʻUmiʻumi Uliuli prepares to kill his wife, she cries out, "E kuu kaikuaana, e Ane!" "Kaikuaʻana" is not what is interesting here; as a Hawaiian kinship term referring specifically to an elder sibling of the same sex, it is the only appropriate choice. Just as the wife calls her older sister "kaikuaʻana," a younger brother would call his older brother "kaikuaʻana." Our ʻōlelo offers no other option. What *is* interesting, however, is what a Hawaiian reader would make of the sisters' relationship because of that kinship term.

The relationship between elder and younger siblings is foundational to Hawaiian understandings of the world. Our most cherished elder/younger sibling relationship is the one between the kanaka, the person, and the ʻāina, the land. It is embodied in the story of Hāloa, the first kalo. Hāloa was the child of Wākea, the Sky Father, and his daughter, Hoʻohokukalani. That first Hāloa was still-born, and buried near the house, where the first kalo plant then grew. Another Hāloa was born of Wākea and Hoʻohokukalani, and he became the progenitor of the Hawaiian people. The reciprocal relationship between elder and younger brothers here actually made life possible. Kalo became the staple of the lāhui Hawaiʻi, feeding the people for generations upon generations, and in turn, feeding and providing for those younger became the elder's responsibility. As for the younger, they cared for the elder—the kalo, but also the ʻāina from which it grew. The younger must therefore create the conditions of abundance that make it possible for the elder to grow. As the kaikuaʻana, then, ʻAne's watching for their brothers, instead of being the passive act of the Western versions, is part of a reciprocal assertion of care for her younger sibling.

Translation does not change "Umiumi Uliuli" into a powerful moʻolelo about mana wahine of the kind celebrated in Hiʻiakaikaipoliopele, or Haumea, or even the history of Kaʻahumanu.

But it does turn a story blaming men's violence on a woman's curiosity into a tale of two sisters relying on their elder/younger sister reciprocal pilina to protect themselves against the enraged ʻUmiʻumi Uliuli until their brothers can dispatch him. Though Whitney may have wanted to foist more of his precious haole manaʻo on the Hawaiian reading public, these tales went through massive transformations merely by entering the world of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi through the process of translation.

Introducing Captain Nemo, Staunch Aloha ʻĀina

The example of "Umiumi Uliuli" suggests how powerful translation could be as a tool for reshaping Western knowledge into forms more understandable and relevant to the lāhui Hawaiʻi. Unlike the concerted effort of Bible translation to maintain an equivalence with the original, even if it meant creating new words, many of the nūpepa translations are tailored to enlighten, but also to entertain—and to sell papers. Traditional, translated, or newly authored, good moʻolelo were the blockbusters of the day, drawing in readers and advertisers. Less explicitly didactic than tales like "Bluebeard," stories like *Tarzan*, *Ivanhoe*, and *The Count of Monte Cristo* might have expanded Hawaiian intellectual ethical horizons somewhat, but their principal purpose was entertainment. But narratives, and especially Hawaiian moʻolelo, also had mana, and were deployed at times to shape public opinion about certain issues. *He Moʻolelo Kaʻao o Kamapuaʻa*, for instance, the story of the sexually voracious pig akua, was published at the height of Kalākaua's push for Hawaiians to hoʻoulu lāhui, or increase the nation. Similarly, the 1893 moʻolelo of Kaluaikoʻolau, about a Hawaiian family resisting the aggression of an outside authority, was re-published in the nūpepa during the Massie Case in the 1930s, when U.S. newspapers were attacking Hawaiʻi and its residents. And Hawaiian translators were also canny enough to bring foreign moʻolelo into the Hawaiian toolbox for pushing values important to the lāhui.

A good example of this is G. W. Kanuha's translation of *20,000 Leagues Under the Sea.* Jules Verne's hugely popular novel was first published in its entirety in the original French in 1870. Kanuha's translation began to appear in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* in 1875. Though said to have translated the moʻolelo from the original French ("Kaʻao Hou" 2), he was renowned for his knowledge of English:

> He kupa Hawaii o Mr Kanuha ma ka ili a ma ka hanau ana, aka, kona waha he waha o ke kanaka Pelekane ma ka olelo Beretania, a e hiki ia ke unuhi laelae mai ka olelo Enelani a i ka olelo Hawaii ("Eehia" 2).
>
> [ʻMr Kanuha is a native of Hawaiʻi in his skin and in his birth, but his mouth is that of a British person when he speaks English, and he can translate with great facility from English to Hawaiian.']

Kanuha was a prolific translator, with a number of stories published in *Kuokoa*. He also helped Sunday Schools by translating texts ("Eehia" 2). Though he translated *20,000 Leagues under the Sea* in its entirety, he died in 1876 at the age of 31, before seeing all of it published.

Especially in the English-speaking world, Captain Nemo is often seen as a cynic, disgusted with society. Steampunk scholar Diana Pho describes him as "short-tempered, tyrannical, and driven by an arrogant misanthropy that leads him to attack civilian and military warships and fund revolutions" ("#2"). Once translated into the moana and the kai, rather than the *mer*, however, he became something different, something altogether more aloha ʻāina.

A powerful concept, aloha ʻāina is the foundation for much of Hawaiian belief and culture. Deserving of a description that would fill a series of books, rather than a few scant paragraphs, it is so important to the argument here that I will nevertheless offer a brief overview. Jamaica Osorio writes that "Aloha ʻāina is central to any moʻolelo of Hawaiʻi because our specific connection and relationship to land informs all of Kanaka Maoli ontology and epistemology" (11). This reciprocal dynamic between land, or ʻāina, and kanaka, or person, insures that everything in the realm of the kanaka is tied to ʻāina: where they are from, where

they are at, how they interact with those around them, what they eat, what they wear, what they hear and see and smell. All of these states and actions are related to ʻāina because of our genealogical connections to the land, because our bones return to it, because everything we need comes from it. Aloha ʻāina also drives Hawaiians to work for the lāhui, the people or the nation, which is bounded by the ʻāina. Made explicit on innumerable occasions in print and in speeches, whenever any Hawaiian is working to benefit the people or protect/increase the ea of the lāhui, they are driven by aloha ʻāina.

This might be a weird trait to associate with a man who almost never wishes to set foot upon dry land, preferring the company of the sea. Yet that is merely a translation problem. "ʻĀina" does not mean "land," but that is the closest understandable shorthand. For us to say "elder sibling who feeds" in places where a reader would expect "land" would draw too much attention to itself and cause confusion. ʻĀina to a Hawaiian is that which feeds and must be cared for and has a genealogical connection to all of us, and what English-speakers understand as "sea" falls into the category of ʻāina as well.

Shoddy early translations of Verne's original French into English diluted much of what made Captain Nemo a staunch anti-colonialist. While most popular versions of Nemo present him as a white European, he was Prince Dakkar, an Indian man whose family was killed in the 1857 uprising against the East India Company (Perschon). Jordan Stump's modern translation of *The Mysterious Island* renders Verne's description of Dakkar/Nemo as "Indian in his heart, Indian in his longing for revenge, Indian in his dreams of reclaiming his native land, driving out the invaders, and inaugurating a new era of independence" (672). Though Nemo's background is not revealed in *20,000 Leagues under the Sea*, it is hinted at in a scene involving an Indian pearl diver. It is not known, but highly possible, that Kanuha read *The Mysterious Island* before translating *20,000 Leagues*, since the former story was published in 1874, and Kanuha's obituary describes him as a voracious reader. No matter how he sat, "aia no ka buke imua o kona maka" ['he always had a book in front of his face'] ("Eehia" 2).

But whether Kanuha knew Nemo's Indian identity or not, his anti-colonial leanings—what some read as his misanthropy—were clear from *20,000 Leagues* and from the Hawaiian translation. Kanuha also seems to be portraying the *Nautilo* (*Nautilus*) as Nemo's ʻāina, inviting readers to see the submarine as Hawaiʻi and Kāpena Nimo as an aloha ʻāina. Kanuha's version was published in the midst of the fierce debates over the Reciprocity Treaty, a free trade agreement that would allow sugar to enter the U.S. duty-free, making Hawaiian sugar competitive with American domestic sugar. What among other things made the debate so fraught was the United States' desire to take control of Puʻuloa, now known as Pearl Harbor, and build a deep-draft harbor. Many Hawaiians, such as Joseph Nāwahī, the representative from Puna, were staunchly opposed to any loss of ʻāina to foreign nations. In Kanuha's translation, when Kāpena Nimo first meets Aronaxa, Nede Lana, and Kosila, he tells them that "Ua hiki mai oukou e hoopilikia wale i koʻu aupuni a me koʻu noho ana" [ʻYou have come to trouble my aupuni and my lifestyle'] ("He Iwakalua" 4 Mar 1876). Because the *Nautilo* is Nimo's aupuni, he won't countenance threats to it. And because that "aupuni" is the word used for "government" or "nation," the valence in this scene differs substantially from the original French, which uses the word "existence" (Verne *Vingt* 66).

Later in the same chapter, Aronaxa observes regarding Nimo, whose name he has not yet learned, that

> Aole o na kanawai pili lahui wale no kana i kaupale aku ai: ua hoolilo maoli no iaia iho, he haku kuokoa no kona mau manao, i kaa loa aku mawaho o na palena a ko ke ao i apono ai, a mawaho hoi o na palena o ko lakou mana! ("He Iwakalua" 4 Mar 1876)
>
> ['It was not merely the laws relating to lāhui that he refuted: he had truly turned himself into a haku with kūʻokoʻa based on his own desires; he is beyond what the world at large deems appropriate, and he is free from the boundaries of their mana!']

With a rogue British captain's six-month takeover of Hawai'i in 1843 still in living memory, and at a moment when the United States was encroaching on the Hawaiian kingdom's ea in exchange for economic concessions through the Reciprocity Treaty, Kanuha's Nimo embodies the weary but resolute aloha 'āina whose fight for his aupuni and the 'āina (kai/moana/*mer*) constitutes the core of his being. Nimo is explicitly pushing for kū'oko'a, a word Hawaiians use when they speak of independence, both on a national and a local scale.

Nimo later addresses his friend Aronaxa passionately:

> A! e noho—e noho iloko o ka poli o na wai! Malaila wale no e loaa ai ia oe ke kuokoa! Malaila i ike ai au, aohe mau haku maluna iho o'u! Malaila ua lanakila au!
>
> ['Indeed! Live—you must live within the bosom of the waters! It is only there where you will find kū'oko'a! It is there that I found no lord to be over me! There I was victorious!'] ("He Iwakalua" 25 Mar 1876)

Again, kū'oko'a is the subject, and for Hawaiian readers, the sea would echo 'āina, leading to a likely reading of this passage that would affirm their kū'oko'a in the 'āina, and remind them to hold fast to aloha 'āina and the connections that make them Hawaiian. It is not certain whether Kalākaua, the new mō'ī of the Hawaiian kingdom, read Verne's original, an English translation, or Kanuha's translation. But the character of Kāpena Nimo, and no doubt his call to return to the 'āina/kai/moana/*mer* in the search for kū'oko'a must have resonated, because Kalākaua built a model of the *Nautilus* that he kept in 'Iolani Palace that is sometimes out on display.

Kalākaua later founded the Papa Kū'auhau, or Genealogy Board, an entity responsible for checking and collecting ali'i genealogies. But as Hawaiian historian Kealani Cook states, because of a far-ranging understanding of genealogy and its connection to knowledge, the charter actually proved much more expansive:

> though restricted by law to research only kū'auhau and mele, the broad definition of kū'auhau included a vast number of sub-disciplines, including: "Physiology,

> Psychology, Philology, Paleontology, Zoology, Botany, Ornithology, and Choncology [the study of mollusks], and other scientific subjects pertaining to the Hawaiian Islands, without which the work of the board would be incomplete." (179-180)

The board and its successor, the Hale Nauā, were founded as means for insisting on the validity, importance, and mana of Hawaiian knowledge. The goal was to create and live as modern Hawaiian peoples standing on the foundations of their culture, rather than always having to react to and refute incorrect assertions by haole. In fact, the board stated that it would not "hooponopono i keia mau buke a me na moolelo i kakau ia e ka haole" ['correct these books and moʻolelo written by the haole'] because it had more than enough to do fulfilling its own mission (Silva *Aloha* 95). As for the Hale Nauā, it was essentially a private outgrowth of the government-sponsored Papa Kūʻauahu. A secret organization, its "object" was "the revival of Ancient Science of Hawaii in combination with the promotion and advancement of Modern Sciences, Art, Literature, and Philanthropy" (*Constitution Hale Naua* 6). The Hale Nauā also ignored the haole moʻolelo about Hawaiians, devoting itself to publishing its own books: "the Genealogy Book of Hawaii, Diametral, Physiography, the practices of high-diving and surfing" and more (*Hale* 123).

Kāpena Nimo's strategy of stepping away from the rest of the world to care for his own aupuni (the *Nautilo*), while constantly educating himself, echoes the philosophy of these two organizations. The Hale Nauā and the Papa Kūʻauhau refused to define themselves in haole terms, or set legibly haole goals. So of course, the predictable critics demonized them, with the Hale Nauā in particular denounced as "an agency for the revival of heathenism, partly to pander to vice, and indirectly to serve as a political machine. Enough leaked out to intensify the general disgust that was felt at the debasing influence of the palace" (Alexander *Kalakaua's* 32). So threatening was the idea of Hawaiians adopting their own approaches to science and modernity, and so intimately linked to the kūʻokoʻa that Nimo said would be found in the

‘āina/kai/moana/*mer*, that in 1895, the newspaper *Ka Makaainana* concluded that “A o kekahi ka hoi o na kumu i kahulihia ai o ke Aupuni Moi, no ka Ahahui Hale Naua” [‘Indeed, one of the reasons that the kingdom was overthrown was the Hale Nauā’] (“Maloo” 5). Kalākaua’s model *Nautilus* and his understanding of Nemo have their correlatives in the mōʻī’s enlistment of technology and knowledge of the ‘āina/kai/moana/*mer* in the cause of staving off foreign depredations.

In the final sessions before the passage of the Reciprocity Treaty, Joseph Nāwahī plays a powerful Kāpena Nimo himself, crying out that:

> he wahi aupuni ko kākou i makaleho ‘ia e nā Haole e lilo no lākou, akā, ua hoka wale nō ia mau hoʻāʻo ‘ana a pau. He nui wale nō nā hoʻāʻo ‘ana a lākou i loko o nā makahiki i hala aku nei, a ‘o ka hāʻawi ‘ana iā Puʻuloa kā lākou hana hope loa i hoʻāʻo ai, a nele ihola. Akā, ‘ānō, ke kāpili nei lākou i kiʻi lio lāʻau me ka hoʻokomo ‘ia o ka ‘enemi i loko. (Kelekona *Puke* 92)
>
> [‘We are a small nation that the foreigners have cast a greedy eye upon, desiring that it pass into their possession, yet their efforts have met with only frustration. They have tried over and over again during these past years, and the attempted cession of Puʻuloa was their latest gambit, and nothing came of it. But here and now they have given us a wooden horse in which our enemies lay in wait.’]

I am not suggesting that Nāwahī had been reading *20,000 Legue malalo o ke Kai*, though he probably had, or that he took his inspiration from Nimo. But I am pointing to affinities between aloha ‘āina like Joseph Nāwahī and the character of Kāpena Nimo as G. W. Kanuha portrayed him through his translation. Especially when its founder Whitney was the editor, *Kuokoa* was explicitly dedicated to assimilating Hawaiians to haole ways of thinking, and he also probably saw Verne’s phenomenally popular novel as a way to sell more papers and advertising space. But in *20,000 Legue malalo o ke Kai*, G. W. Kanuha produced a thrilling and entertaining

mo‘olelo that could also inspire Hawaiians to stand for their ‘āina and their ea, and to fight against the forces of colonialism, as Nimo and his *Nautilo* did.

“Umiumi Uliuli” and *20,000 Legue malalo o ke Kai* are two examples from one not especially sympathetic newspaper of the power that translation could potentially offer Hawaiians to push for their ea and their mana. When we consider that hundreds and thousands of translation moments occur in each issue, and sometimes on every page, of the nūpepa, and that they continued on well into the Territorial period, the sheer amount of contextual and thematic contestation/mitigation/attenuation involved in the shifting of material into a Hawaiian worldview is awe-inspiring. And Hawaiian translators were negotiating this every day with ease, using the tools for their own purposes and ends, all the while developing a more sophisticated and pragmatic understanding of what unuhi can do.

Descendants of Ka Hoku

Though at certain moments, and with certain editors, *Kuokoa* can be a nūpepa that acknowledges the ea and mana of the lāhui Hawai‘i, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* is the true progenitor of nationalist Hawaiian newspapers, and its keiki and mo‘opuna were legion. Kānepu‘u traces the genealogy from the just over 80 weeks of life before *Ka Hoku* went to hiamoe [‘sleep’], through *Ke Au Okoa* in 1865, *Ko Hawaii Ponoi* in 1873, *Ka Lahui Hawaii* right after, and then *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* in 1878, when he is writing (“Ahe!” 1). If Kānepu‘u had been around to continue the list decades later, he would have included *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* in 1889, *Hawaii Holomua* in 1893, *Ka Makaainana* in 1894, and *Ke Aloha Aina* in 1895. Especially when edited by John E. Bush, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* had a circulation of 4,000; *Hawaii Holomua*, with the Hawaiian side edited by Kahikina Kelekona and Joseph Poepoe, had a circulation of 5,000 (Chapin *Shaping* 94).

The editors of these papers—Bush, Kelekona, Nāwahī, Joseph Poepoe, and F. J. Testa—were impressively bilingual, writing and translating in English or Hawaiian (*Makaainana*

15 Apr 1895). These nūpepa provided a forum for arguments regarding everything from elections, to the Reciprocity Treaty, to people's opinions about translations of textbooks, and supplying such a forum was an especially important service at the time of the Bayonet Constitution, when a cabal of businessmen and missionary descendants forced Kalākaua to sign a constitution they had drafted. It severely limited his powers; disenfranchised Asians, who had been largely supportive of the monarchy; and used property and income qualifications to ensure that the electorate was disproportionately made up of wealthy whites. Or as Jon Osorio explains, it was with 1887 constitution that "haole businessmen would finally succeed in taming, once and for all, the power of the monarch and the Native electors" (129). The Missionary Party had undoubtedly grabbed a great deal of power, and the law no longer provided much recourse for Hawaiians. But the nūpepa were in full force and even getting stronger, becoming one of the last battlefields where Hawaiians held the upper hand. As Hawaiian scholar Tiffany Ing points out,

> *Ka Leo* featured some of the most explosive and exhilarating nationalist writers and editors—John Bush, J. W. Mikasobe, F. Meka, J. K. Kaunamano, S. P. Kanoe, and Thomas Spencer. They publicly declared their deep-seated Hawaiian nationalism, were often fearless in their language and accusations, and expressed anger against Kalākaua's opponents. They could be meticulous in their investigations, and undeniably steadfast in their devotion to the mōʻī and Kānaka ʻŌiwi. Printing their allegations in English as well, Ka Leo boldly sought the attention of the Hawaiian League. (308)

Though *Ka Leo* boasted a deep bench of such highly bilingual people as John Bush and Thomas Spencer, who could challenge opponents of the lāhui in Hawaiian and in translation, it was not alone in its attacks. Because establishment papers formerly critical of Kalākaua's government were now trying to prop up the Bayonet Constitution, the nūpepa aloha ʻāina knew they were in the sights of the Hawaiian League and its supporters:

> In an editorial on "Christian Civilization," [*The Hawaiian Gazette*] accused *Ka Nupepa Elele* (The newspaper messenger) (1885–1892) and *Ka Oiaio* (The truth) (1889–1896) of "falsehoods and irritating statements" about the new government leaders and added a veiled threat: "We have simply this to say to the conductors of these journals that there is a point beyond which it is not safe to proceed, and it will be wise to heed this advice. (*Shaping* 84)

As it had in Britain through the Stamp duties and the resulting "War of the Unstamped," a minority establishment using all the means at its disposal to prevent the oppressed from having a voice would lead to violence, suppression, and arrests. The threats were real, but the nūpepa editors kept on. Even though the nūpepa were not of the same opinion—some were critical of Kalākaua[21] and later Lili'uokalani—they continued to resist, because they knew that supporting those backed by the establishment papers would ultimately lead to the loss of Hawaiian sovereignty. So they kept urging the lāhui to stand up and agitate, and Lili'uokalani, hearing the voice of her people in the nūpepa and petitions, decided to promulgate a new constitution that would undo the injustices of the Bayonet. Spoiling for rhetorical fights, the nationalist papers supported her, but once again, when Hawaiians had mastered the rules of the game and started using them for their own benefit, just as the missionaries had demonized *Ka Hoku*, and the haole judges had undermined the authority of Hawaiian law, the Missionary Party and the sugar planting cabal, no longer able to win at their own game, upset the board. In 1893, with the help of U.S. minister John L. Stevens and American troops, a conspiracy of white businessmen, sugar planters, and missionary descendants overthrew the lawful government of the Hawaiian kingdom. To avoid loss of life, Lili'uokalani yielded her authority under protest to the United States, placing her hopes in the negotiated diplomacy that Hawaiians had been taught ensured

[21] Tiffany Ing's 2015 dissertation, *Ka Ho'omālamalama 'ana o nā Hō'ailona o ka Mō'ī Kalākaua a me Kona Noho Ali'i 'ana: Illuminating the American, International, and Hawai'i Representations of David Kalākaua and His Reign, 1874-1891*, forthcoming as a book, presents a very detailed look at how aloha 'āina and missionary party supporter alike critiqued Kalākaua, but pointing out important differences in their approaches and motives.

justice and fairness in the interactions between civilized nations. It had worked five decades earlier, when Great Britain restored Hawaiian sovereignty after a six-month takeover by the rogue Lord George Paulet, and it was a fundamental principle of the legal system that the mōʻī had been trying to preserve with her new constitution. But in the aftermath of the overthrow, diplomacy seemed only to work for the haole.

At this point, translation became an even more important tool for the nūpepa aloha ʻāina, allowing them to disseminate important documents that the lāhui would not have access to otherwise. It was for example *Hawaii Holomua*, edited on the Hawaiian side by Kahikina Kelekona, that printed Liliʻuokalani's protest and her appeal to Cleveland in both Hawaiian and English (18 Jan 1893 2). After the formation of the Hui Aloha ʻĀina, or Hawaiian Patriotic League, many of its resolutions and memorials were printed in Hawaiian and English, again deploying translation for Hawaiian purposes. On the eve of the formation of the so-called Republic of Hawaii in 1894, for instance, *Hawaii Holomua* printed a translation of the Hui's resolution against it:

> Be it resolved. That the Hui Aloha Aina and other patriotic leagues, together with the loyal subjects of the Hawaiian Kingdom, in mass meeting assembled, representing by far the greater majority of the legitimate voters of this country, do hereby most solemnly protest against the promulgation of a new Constitution, formed without the consent and participation of the people, and we also protest against changing the form of government from the one under which we have lived peacefully and prosperously for many years. And that we maintain that the will of the majority of the legitimate voters of Hawaii should be the supreme power of the land, as such power is so recognized and accepted in all civilized countries, and by all the enlightened governments of the world. (3 Jul 1894, 2)

Publishing the Hawaiian version insured that the lāhui would know what was going on. But why the English, since the Provisional Government and most foreigners would hardly be swayed? I

would suggest the English audience lived elsewhere. At a time of widespread distortion and misrepresentation, the constant flow of newspapers between the United States and Hawai‘i meant that those in power in America could know what the people of Hawai‘i actually believed.

The nūpepa aloha ‘āina were such a thorn in the oligarchy’s side after the overthrow that in its imposed constitution the Republic essentially eliminated freedom of the press, and made it easier to prosecute newspaper editors for libel.[22] Article 3 was breathtakingly hypocritical:

> Except as herein provided, all men may freely speak, write and publish their sentiments on all subjects; and no law shall be enacted to restrain the liberty of speech or the press; but all persons shall be responsible for the abuse of such right; and no person shall advocate, by writing printing or speaking, the restoration or establishment of a monarchical form of government in the Hawaiian islands; nor advocate the use of force for the accomplishment of any change in the system or form of government hereby established; nor seek or advocate the action of any foreign power for such purpose, except by treaty duly made in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution. (1–3)

The intentions here are obvious. People who oppose the new government do not have freedom of speech; nor may anyone advocate for carrying out a change of government *using exactly the same mechanism that the Republic supporters had to gain power*. Then, in the last clause, the supposed political leaders exempt themselves from their “nation’s” own law by allowing for the possibility of negotiating an annexation treaty. What is really motivating this article, however, is fear. Threatened by the very existence of a nationalist press, the Republic’s constitution made suppression of the native voice the law of the land.

When people trot out the old standby argument that colonialism always wins out, that America was a juggernaut that was always going to be victorious, here is a moment when

[22] There had been a spate of libel lawsuits against newspapermen since the 1880s, including John Bush, Robert Wilcox, and the Chinese newspaper owner and journalist Ho Fun (Chapin *Shaping* 87).

Hawaiians can demonstrate that no one was sure of the outcome. Chapin estimates that the "opposition papers" then represented roughly 85% of the population (*Shaping* 93–94). The nūpepa aloha ʻāina were the voice of the people, and also had their ear, stirring them to action. Supported neither by the public, nor any coherent rule of law, the oligarchy had no real option other than to arrest anyone who reminded people of these facts. The result was a farcical series of newspaper editor arrests. Kelekona was charged and fined for libel (*Holomua* 15 Feb 1893). G. Carson Kenyon was charged with criminal libel. Edmund Norrie was fined $100 for seditious libel. The most extreme response came six months after the declaration of the Republic:

> Aia hoʻi i ka mahina ʻo Kekemapa, 1894, ua hopu ʻia ihola ʻo Hon. J. Nāwahī me J. Ailuene Buki no ka ʻōhumu a hoʻāla kipi, a hoʻopaʻa ʻia i loko o ka hale paʻahao. A i loko mai o Ianuali, 1895, ua hoʻokuʻu ʻia lāua. Akā, ʻaʻole nō naʻe i liʻuliʻu ma hope iho, ua ulu hou aʻela he mau kumu hoʻoulukū i nā noʻonoʻo o nā mana hoʻokele i ke Aupuni Kūikawā no ka hoʻāʻo ʻia e hoʻihoʻi hou mai i ke kūlana a me ka mana Aupuni Mōʻī. No laila, ua hoʻopaʻa loa ʻia ihola ʻo ia me J. Ailuene Buki me ke kiaʻi paʻa ʻia a me ka hoʻomalu loa ʻia a hiki i ka manawa i pau ai i ka hopuhopu ʻia a hoʻopaʻa ʻia he mau haneli o nā Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī a me kekahi poʻe Haole o ko nā ʻāina ʻē i hoʻohuoi ʻia. (Kelekona *Moʻolelo Nāwahī* 135)
>
> [ʻIn December of 1894, the Hon. J. Nāwahī and J. Ailuene Buki (Bush) were arrested and jailed on charges of sedition and fomenting rebellion. In January, 1895, they were released. But in almost no time, more reasons that perturbed the driving powers of the Provisional Government arose with the attempt to restore the status and power of the monarchy. So Nāwahī and Bush were detained again under severe restriction with guards posted until the arrests of hundreds of Hawaiian suspects and their haole allies were finished.']

The counter-revolt of 1895 was an armed attempt to promulgate a new constitution, written by Charles Gulick (Alexander *History* 216), that would undo much of the Bayonet Constitution and

restore Lili‘uokalani to the throne. The multi-ethnic revolutionaries were known as koa aloha ‘āina, or those who fought on behalf of aloha ‘āina. The plot was uncovered, and leaders Sam Nowlein and Robert Wilcox had to set everything in motion too early. After a firefight that included cannons, the rebels were defeated and over 300 people were arrested. The day after the failed counter-revolt of 1895, along with Bush and Nāwahī, nūpepa editors and contributors E. C. Crick, Daniel Logan, Edmund Norrie, Thomas Tamaki Spencer, W. J. Kapi, J. K. Kaunamano, G. C. Kenyon, and F. J. Testa were arrested for seditious libel (*Shaping* 103), and the fact that these journalists were jailed with the armed revolutionaries shows just how much the Republic feared the power of the papers. (Editors Bush and Norrie tied for the most arrests with five each between 1893 and 1895.) Their papers were all shut down while they were imprisoned, and the sole nūpepa in print at the time was the establishment *Kuokoa.*

If writing and translating were what led to the prosecution of these nūpepa aloha ‘āina, translation was one of the tools used to keep them out of jail as well. As mentioned above, in 1895, George Carson Kenyon, a haole editor, was arrested for seditious libel, and some of the correspondence about his trial sheds light on the surprising ways the nūpepa aloha ‘āina were using translation. Both Kenyon and Kelekona were editors at *Hawaii Holomua*, one of the most radical papers of the time. Referring to the 1895 counter-revolt, E. G. Hitchcock, marshall of the Republic, states that “To the *Holomua*, as conducted by Kenyon, and later by Norrie, must be assigned the chief part in my opinion in promoting and stirring up the uprising that took place in January last” (*Correspondence* 133). Though he chauvinistically refuses to mention the agency of Kahikina Kelekona, Hitchcock clearly acknowledges the power of the nūpepa aloha ‘āina, concluding that “Revolutions are not started these days without the aid of newspapers” (133).

In his deposition, Kahikina Kelekona testified that while Kenyon himself wrote many of the radical articles appearing in Hawaiian, he also exhorted Kelekona to use his considerable literary talents in the same cause: “Following his instructions, I wrote as violently as I dared against the Government, yet Kenyon said I was not writing hot enough, and kept stirring me up

to write hotter still" (*Correspondence* 138). But since Kenyon and Kelekona knew that the understanding of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi among those serving in Provisional Government and the Republic was often weak, "The English portion of the paper [. . .] was not so strong as the native. Kenyon would sit down and write a very violent article in English for me to translate into Hawaiian, then he would tone down his English copy a great deal and then put it into the paper" (138), thereby often eluding the government monitors.

According to Kelekona, "The whole plan and policy of the Hawaiian portion of the paper as run by Kenyon and myself was to fire the native to an extent that there could be no reconciliation between them and the new government. The one object being the restoration of the Queen. Kenyon and I were working for nothing else" (138). With no small measure of pride, Kelekona went on to declare that

> Our paper was the most radical paper published in the Hawaiian language, at the time and it fired the natives so that they were prepared to revolt against the Government if it was necessary to get the Queen back. The honest truth was that it was a revolutionary paper and nothing else. Its policy was to make the native irreconcilable, and it succeeded. It had subscribers among the natives all over the Islands. To this day you will hear natives say that no paper published since the overthrow has exceeded in the violence or has been stronger or more effective than that paper published by Kenyon and myself. It has had a great effect on the native people. (139)

Of course, this is *exactly* what the Republic's constitution outlawed. How then did the *Holomua* get away with this to such an extent that Hitchcock called it the chief cause of the 1895 counter-revolt?

The answer was translation. Since the law "allowing" for freedom of speech itemizes what *cannot* be said, the intelligent multi-lingual editors of the nūpepa knew exactly what to avoid saying—or to say they avoided saying. Missionary descendant William Luther Wilcox, the

official government interpreter and translator since 1867, was also deposed, and offered a highly-informed explanation of how the editors of *Hawaii Holomua* and other nūpepa aloha ʻāina managed for the most part to avoid arrest:

> The Hawaiian language is one peculiarly adapted to convey intelligence by innuendo or suggestion merely, and the natives are a very secretive people and peculiarly fitted to convey intelligence to each other in the same way. These facts could not fail to be known to anyone reasonably well acquainted with them. Language in the mouth of a Hawaiian often means something serious when the same in the English language would mean nothing. (*Correspondence* 140)

Wilcox is describing kaona, a foundational feature of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi by which different audiences receive different messages depending on whether they are meant to know. Such metaphorical and/or contextually-based references were present in all manner of speech, from elevated pule directed to the akua to the more pedestrian interactions in everyday life. Common conventions include referring to lovers as embodying ʻāina (Osorio, Ja. 124), or particular kinds of flowers or birds. Similarly, speaking of drinking water from a particular kind of leaf might actually be referring to sex or intimate relationships. What distinguishes kaona from metaphorical speech, however, is that the meaning is always directed. The same reference may have completely different connotations depending on whether you are the intended audience or not, and there can be comprehension levels within that audience as well. At the 50th birthday party for my Hawaiian-language mentor, for instance, I gave a very metaphor-filled speech in Hawaiian honoring the knowledge he had given me, and his effect upon my life. But the imagery I used to craft the metaphors honoring him also contained metaphorical references acknowledging my love for friends of mine in the audience. If you were not one of those friends, you heard an speech honoring an important figure in our community. If however you were part of my circle, you certainly heard how much I cared for my mentor, but knew that my friends deserved honor as well.

This feature of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi is much appreciated when we can decipher kaona and/or the kaona is directed toward us; however, its prevalence in so many aspects of our language makes kaona a nightmare for translators today. But it proved a blessing for those seeking to evade and outwit the Provisional Government's and the Republic's clumsy legal system. Though the authors were almost always saying something politically pointed, the surface meaning of the Hawaiian words and sentences was presenting something that could be translated as totally innocuous. William Wilcox confirms this strategy: "Many of these editors were arrested now and then, but nothing came of the prosecutions. They always had a plausible and harmless interpretation to give to their utterances and it was next to impossible to convict them before juries" (*Correspondence* 140). So even though they were "pouring it in hot," most editors avoided conviction by "accurately" translating their words in the blandest way possible.

Though the brilliant, fiery, and beloved Joseph Nāwahī was jailed for several months, contracting the tuberculosis that soon cost him his life, translation therefore kept many other nūpepa aloha ʻāina from serving significant jail time. The lāhui suffered a tremendous blow with the overthrow. Compounded by the failed counter-revolt, and the mandated change of the language of instruction in schools to English in 1896, these blows would contribute heavily to separating future generations of aloha ʻāina from their language and culture. But at the time, the nūpepa aloha ʻāina pressed on, fighting in the face of persecution for the ea and mana of the lāhui, and getting the word out about such anti-annexation efforts as the Hui Aloha ʻĀina's and Hui Kālaiʻāina's huge petition drives and mass meetings. And when Liliʻuokalani wrote *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen* in English, though addressed as "a plea to Americans in general, and to members of the U.S. Congress in particular, to consider the retention of Hawaiian sovereignty, rather than proceeding with the annexation of the Islands" (Forbes xv), soon after its release the nūpepa began to translate it into ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, assuring Hawaiian readers that Queen supported them and was speaking on behalf of the lāhui. Though never completely translated, the installments that were fittingly appeared in *Ke Aloha Aina*, the newspaper

founded by the late Joseph Nāwahī and his wife Emma, for according to the editors at that time, the Queen's moʻolelo was filled with "na olelo walania a ku i ke aloha no Kona hookahuli ia ana. Aloha no Oia" ['anguished words full of aloha in regards to her overthrow. Aloha to her!'] (19 Mar 1898, 5).

But even as the nūpepa stood firm in their aloha for the mōʻī and the lāhui, their audience grew smaller and less powerful. Hawaiian-language newspapers continued on until after World War II, with translations remaining a fundamental component until the end. As the overthrow and annexation receded further into the past, however, the stakes became less urgent. Translation was no longer the one thing that might stand between you and jail time. The translated foreign moʻolelo were no longer offering insight into treaties being negotiated with the United States. Moʻolelo like *Tarzan* were still being translated, but they were appearing alongside editorials with titles like "Pehea e Mau ai ke Ola ana o ka Olelo Hawaii?" ['How Will ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi Keep Living?'] (*Ka Na'i Aupuni* 5 Jan 1906), "Mai Haalele i ka Olelo Makuahine" ['Don't Abandon Your Mother Tongue'] (*Kuokoa Home Rula* 22 Mar 1907), "E Ae Anei Kakou e Make ka Olelo Hawaii?" ['Are We Truly Going to Allow ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi to Die?'] (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 6 Jan 1922).

Our language did not die, but it was a close thing. Nearly nine decades passed before we could teach schoolchildren in Hawaiian again. During those years, as the number of speakers dwindled and the fortunes of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi waned, so too did the power of translation into Hawaiian. No longer a tool of ea and mana that the lāhui could use to make something their own, translation became something wielded primarily by those who wanted to talk *about* Hawaiians, not *to* them. Translation no longer gave mana, becoming instead a means for extracting ʻike and moʻolelo out of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi.

But this would not be the end either.

CHAPTER 4: ENTOMBED IN TRANSLATION: THE GOLDEN AGE OF EXTRACTIVE TRANSLATION

She couldn't help but smile when she saw the Royal Portable typewriter waiting for her as she approached her new desk. The keys gleamed and the duotone crinoline blue was so modern! She knew the museum had money, but this was state of the art, and she was just a volunteer.

She had been directed to a creaky metal chair and a thick wooden desk next to rank upon rank of filing cabinets. The newness of the typewriter was incongruous with the smell of old paper that seemed to permeate every surface in the office. Everything was so imposing and stern, even the two smiling kūpuna in front of her, though she tried not to let it show.

She fidgeted with her newly permed hair as she sat down. She felt a little overdressed in her dark blouse and long skirt next to the two gray-haired women. Both wore understated mu'umu'u with muted floral patterns, but if they made anything of her outfit they gave no sign.

The one with glasses on, Lahilahi, patted her hand and told her to make herself comfortable. The other, wearing a kukui lei, had introduced herself as Mary, though that was unnecessary. Mary Kawena Pukui and her work were the reasons that she was there.

All these translation projects were so exciting. Her parents still spoke Hawaiian, though she didn't, so she was thrilled to help preserve Hawaiian knowledge in any way that she could.

Mary handed her a heavy file folder, and asked if she could standardize them into the same format, something that would make it easier to work with. She paged through them quickly just to assess the contents and saw a mishmash of handwritten and typed documents. One had even been typed in all capital letters!

It looked like a big job, but that was what she had signed up for. And it looked important. Mary and Lahilahi told her to feel free to go see them if she had any questions and left her to her work.

Lahilahi looked back over her shoulder and gave her a surprisingly mischievous grin. She also heard Mary mutter in an undertone that some of the translations didn't even deserve to be typed up.

When they left, she shrugged and got to work, arranging the documents for transcription. She smiled to herself. She was just happy to be doing work that mattered here in the Anthropology Department at the museum.

As recounted in Chapter Three, though Hawaiian-language publications continued to appear, the Provisional Government and then the Republic kept trying to silence aloha ʻāina newspaper firebrands such as John E. Bush, Joseph Nāwahī, and Kahikina Kelekona through libel laws, accusations of sedition, and press confiscations. Under the watchful eye of sharpshooters, the Republic deported Hawaiians that they felt threatened their unjust rule or sent them to work on road crews with other "criminals" (Palmer 8–9). ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi was in the paradoxical position of simultaneously being at the peak of its expressive power but also quite far along in its decline. And predictably, the wielding of translation by Hawaiians for Hawaiian purposes shared the fortunes of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. Besides the overtly material clashes between Hawaiians and the ruling oligarchy, the end of the nineteenth century also brought about the culmination of many of these less obvious forces vying for control in the kingdom. When the language was strong and vibrant, Hawaiians had used translation confidently, as a sign of a certain cosmopolitanism, and even during the troubled times at the end of the century, Hawaiians employed it strategically to serve national ends. With the decline of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, however, translations shifted from being primarily *by* Hawaiians to being *about* Hawaiians. The first three chapters have discussed the various roles that translation played during the kingdom era. This chapter deals with how this shift of purpose, the assumed audience for translations, and the actions of the people involved in producing them have affected how Hawaiian history has come to be understood, and in many cases misunderstood.

As Hawaiian literary scholar kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui points out, translation in this time period resulted in "translation practices of language and culture that disparage Native people and substantiate colonialism" (5%). The undermining of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi as the foundation upon which Hawaiian culture rests, and the declining status of the language—and Hawaiians themselves—in the educational system, severely affected Hawaiian exercises of ea and mana over the first decades of the twentieth century. And translation into Hawaiian can be thought of as the canary in the coal mine, signaling the danger facing the lāhui. The erosion of translational activity in Hawaiian pointed to declining sovereignty over how Hawaiians interacted with the outside world. Rather than being translated, considered, and valued through the lens of a Hawaiian worldview, information and knowledge from Western sources now arrived in English and stayed that way. In addition, the growing practice of translation out of, rather than into, Hawaiian paralleled the steady rise in the number of exclusively English-speakers, mostly non-Hawaiian, whose access to Hawaiian history and culture was therefore restricted to such translations. Even more chilling, ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi use declined so swiftly that within a few decades, English translations were often the only sources of Hawaiian-produced information that Hawaiians could access about themselves.

In 1898, eleven Hawaiian-language nūpepa were appearing simultaneously—the largest number ever—and kākau moʻolelo such as Kahikina Kelekona were writing experimental moʻolelo and fiction using highly elevated and sophisticated ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi in genres that had never been attempted before. Yet at the same moment, the education system was salting the ground from which Hawaiian-language translators had grown. By 1895 only three schools in Hawaiʻi out of 187 (Department of Public Instruction 11) were using ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi as their medium of instruction, reaching 59 students out of a total of 12,616 (Department of Public Instruction 11, 21). None of the schools were in an urban center. Two were on Hawaiʻi Island, and one on Niʻihau (Department of Public Instruction 14), and petitions were circulating to convert them into English language schools as well (Department of Public Instruction 21). This

process had started during the kingdom. Fifteen years earlier, when the number of Hawaiian-language schools had already dropped from a previous high of 226 to less than 80 (Department of Public Instruction 22), Charles Reed Bishop, the president of the Board of Education, had reported that "the continuance and increase of public day schools for teaching Hawaiians the English language has been construed to imply the gradual supplanting of the Hawaiian by the English, and the final extinction of the Hawaiian language" (Board of Education *Biennial 1880* 9), a "policy" that the Educational Committee of the Legislature had grave doubts about. At that time, however, the BOE denied that this was the desired end of its push for English language education. Hawaiian could never be so easily extinguished.

With the downward trend in Hawaiian-medium schools well under way, these 1880 Board of Education protestations seem particularly disingenuous, and by 1895, linguist, historian, fervent supporter of the overthrow, and then-president of the Board of Education W. D. Alexander approvingly announced that "Schools taught in the Hawaiian language have virtually ceased to exist and will probably never appear again in a Government report"

> Hawaiian parents without exception prefer that their children should be educated in the English language. The gradual extinction of a Polynesian dialect may be regretted for sentimental reasons, but it is certainly for the interest of the Hawaiians themselves. (Department of Public Instruction 6-7)

This was the death knell for institutional Hawaiian-language translation. There was no longer a need for textbooks in Hawaiian, and in the view of some of the board such as Alexander, no longer a need for speakers in Hawaiian. Though he wrote a book on Hawaiian grammar, Alexander's response to the loss of this "Polynesian dialect" speaks for itself.

In his report, Alexander continued on to call for the revision of school laws because they were based on a system of Hawaiian-language schools that had all but disappeared. So rather than Hawaiian, his calls that school instruction be in English only actually come in response to a different language:

> Another thing that should receive attention is the establishment of certain private schools conducted solely in the Chinese language.
>
> An amendment to the school law should require that all children shall be instructed in the English language, which would compel the closing of such schools. There are only 74 children attending these schools at present, but they will undoubtedly increase unless something is done. (Department of Public Instruction 24)

The Republic of Hawai‘i granted Alexander's wish in 1896, with the passage of Section 30 of Act 57:

> The English language shall be the medium and basis of instruction in all public and private schools, provided that where it is desired that another language shall be taught in addition to the English language, such instruction may be authorized by the Department, either by its rules, the curriculum of the school, or by direct order in any particular instance. Any schools that shall not conform to the provisions of this Section shall not be recognized by the Department.

Though some scholars mistakenly point to Act 57 as the beginning of the decline of the Hawaiian language (K. Silva 92; Oliveira 79–80), the Board of Education reports quoted above reveal that the Hawaiian language's place in education was precarious well before Act 57. While motivated at least in part by the Chinese language schools, this amendment would hinder Hawaiian-language revitalization efforts for ninety years. The Organic Act of 1900 further entrenched the primacy of English, mandating that all legislative proceedings be held in English, and that while voters could be fluent in Hawaiian or English, court jurors had to be able to speak English (Nogelmeier 15).

At this point, over 99 percent of Hawaiian students were taught in English, and social stigma and sometimes physical punishment awaited those who spoke Hawaiian at school. Kūpuna who grew up in the wake of Act 57 interviewed by Larry Kimura on his radio show *Ka*

Leo Hawai‘i in the 1970s recalled how they were punished for speaking ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. Helen Wahineokai remembered that it was forbidden at Mauna‘olu Seminary on Maui, and that her letters were censored if written in Hawaiian even after she began attending Kamehameha. When other students heard Dan Hanakahi speaking Hawaiian and reported him to the teacher, he was beaten with a stick. Small wonder, then, that Sarah Nākoa’s kupuna told her: “Aia ke ola o ka noho ‘ana ma kēia mua aku i ka ‘ike pono i ka ‘ōlelo a ka po‘e Haole” [‘The way to survive from now on is to know thoroughly the language of the Haole’] (19).

The proper language of instruction, whether English or Hawaiian, had been debated publicly at least since 1860 when *Ka Hae Hawaii* described the arguments in the English-language newspapers about this issue.*The Polynesian* came down on the side of English, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* on the Hawaiian side (“Hoopaapaa”). Editorials decrying the decline in quality/usage and even the possible disappearance of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i began appearing around this time as well, but they took on a particular urgency after Act 57.

In 1906, the newspaper *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, edited by Joseph Poepoe, ran an editorial entitled “Mai Haalele i Kau Olelo Makuahine” [‘Do Not Forsake Your Mother Tongue’]. In it, the author states that the people of the nation have not been well-served by only putting their efforts towards learning English:

> Oiai makou e kakoo aku ana i ua iini holomua o na poe ike olelo Beritania, ma ke ano, he mea pono i ko Hawaii nei lahui opio ke hoomaamaaia ma ka ike olelo Beritania, oia hoi ka olelo Enelani, i mea e loaa ai i ka opio na keehina holo mama ma ke au awiwi o ka holomua e nee nei maluna o ka hapanui o ka ilihonua, mamuli o na hoonee ana a ka olelo Beritania, eia nae, aole no he mea hewa no ka opio hanau o Hawaii, o ka oi aku nae, ke ike maopopo i ka olelo a kona mau kupuna.
>
> [‘While we support the idea that those knowledgeable in English hold, namely that it is necessary for the youth of the lāhui Hawai‘i to get familiar with English,

so that they are able to move nimbly through the swiftly flowing currents of progress driven by English and running across the majority of the earth's surface, we must nevertheless say that there is nothing wrong, and indeed it would serve them even better, if they were well-versed in the language of their kūpuna.']

The author blames the fact that the government schools are no longer taught in Hawaiian for a lot of issues facing the lāhui, and mentions the ever-shrinking pool of places where young people can gain knowledge of Hawaiian: the churches and Sunday schools, books and newspapers ma ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i, and places where "na Hawaii maoli" ['true/real Hawaiians'] gather. As this pool shrinks, so too does the pool from which both Hawaiian-language translators and the audience for Hawaiian-language translations are drawn.

In "Ka Olelo Makuahine a ka Lahui Hawaii," a 1912 article from *Hawaii Holomua*, the author argues that English is hardly the easy path to progress that Hawaiians have been promised, and particularly when racism gets involved. The author notes how Black Americans speak English perfectly well, and yet

> He poe Amelika lakou, aka, ua lohe anei kakou e kapaia ana lakou ma ia inoa? Aole, he Nekelo no lakou . . . I keia la, ua ikeia ka lahui Hawaii, aka, ke namu mai na keiki Hawaii, aole lakou e kapaia aku ana he poe Amelika, a i ole ia, he poe Pelekane paha, aole loa. He poe Nekelo. (25)
>
> ['They are Americans, but have we ever heard them referred to as such? No, they are called Negroes . . . These days, people are familiar with the lāhui Hawai'i, but should Hawaiian children speak English, they too are not thought to be Americans or British, not at all. They too are called Negroes.']

This author goes astray in their analysis of the racism faced by Black people in the United States, blaming much of their suffering on being cut off from their ancestral languages, rather than colonialism, the global slave trade, or the specific American legacy of slavery. But the writer entreats Hawaiians to stand together and demand a return to Hawaiian language schools,

or at least a few hours a day of Hawaiian language schooling, because if ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi disappears, so will Hawaiians.

A decade later, even *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, historically very pro-American and pro-establishment, runs an article entitled "E Ae Anei Kakou e Make ka Olelo Hawaii?" [ʻAre We Truly Going to Just Let the Hawaiian Language Die?']. The ramifications of Act 57 are still being felt almost three decades later:

> Ua kamaaina kakou, o ka olelo Beritania ka olelo lahui i keia la, no ke kumu, o ia ka olelo a ke kanawai e kauoha mai nei. A aole e hiki i ka ahaolelo e komo mai, a kauoha e aʻoia ka olelo Hawaii maloko o na kula aupuni, elike me ko kakou makemake. He oiaio e hiki ana no e aʻoia ma kekahi mau papa, elike me ka olelo Palani ame Italia, e aʻoia mai nei; aka, aole o ia ano aʻo ka kakou i makemake ai, no ke kumu, aole e loaa ana ka ike i makemakeia e kakou.
>
> [ʻWe are all well aware that English is the language of our people today, because it is the language that the law has demanded. And the legislature cannot step forward and order that Hawaiian be taught in the schools as we wish it to be. It is true that it can be taught as a subject, just like French and Italian are, but that is not what we want because they will not attain the level of knowledge that we want them to.']

For this author, the answer is to build schools for Hawaiians to learn ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, and since the government will likely not support them, the lāhui Hawaiʻi itself must pay for the buildings and teachers.

Along with the legal obstacles, and the pressures to give Hawaiian keiki the tools to "succeed," according to US census reports, between 1900 and 1950, 293,000 Americans immigrated to Hawaiʻi, exacerbating the linguistic, political, and cultural challenges facing the lāhui. The sham annexation and illegal acquisition of Hawaiʻi aroused a great deal of curiosity about the islands. Periodicals such as *Paradise of the Pacific* helped whet American appetites

for human interest stories about Hawai‘i, and more scholarly treatments were brought to bear on the multi-racial population as well. And while translation was still a major feature of the nūpepa, bringing into ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i pulpy adventures like Tarzan or lesser-known tales like *Geoffrey's Victory; Or, The Double Deception*, the papers themselves were declining in numbers and circulation. The forces of "Americanism," essentially a movement to whitewash difference out of any non-white person (meaning nearly all of Hawai‘i), really came into play in the 1940s as well (Kam 137). Its "Talk American" campaign led to attacks on Japanese and Chinese language schools, and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i continued to be denigrated as an obstacle to progress and Americanization. Consequently, the direction of the vast majority of translation shifted, moving from ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i into English, often explicitly justified as an effort to save Hawaiian knowledge and other intellectual curiosities as the people themselves disappeared.

Outward bound

As the political sovereignty of the lāhui Hawai‘i waned and the kingdom seemed increasingly a thing of the past, literary sovereignty declined as well. Hawaiians had little control over what stories were told about them, or how these stories were circulated—whether in advertisements offering willing brown hula maidens to tourists, or in the sensationalistic news coverage of the Massie case, warning America about lurking bestial savages. Translation was equally out of Hawaiian hands, as for nearly a century, extractive models would become the norm. No longer for other Hawaiians or even citizens of the kingdom, these translations were almost exclusively directed at foreign scholars, social scientists, and researchers. Though many of these Hawaiian-to-English products were eventually made available to the general public, and therefore to Hawaiians themselves, these audiences did not ask for or shape these translations.

Seldom directed at a living, vibrant language, extractive translation responds to the felt needs of academics in various branches of study. The demand for such translations confirms

that these readers are by definition not Hawaiian intellectuals, but foreign "experts" who cannot understand Hawaiian, but see this as no obstacle to studying Hawai'i. One reason that Lili'uokalani herself gave for translating the Kumulipo while she was imprisoned in 'Iolani Palace was that "it may also be of value to genealogists and scientific men of a few societies to which a copy will be forwarded. The folk-lore or traditions of an aboriginal people have of late years been considered of inestimable value" (vii).[23] According to its editor and translator Thomas Thrum, Abraham Fornander's collection of folklore was published with the Hawaiian source material because it would "add to its scientific value" (Fornander *Vol 4* 2), but the greatest value, given the readership, came from the translations. Accompanying "He Mele no Kuali'i," for instance, was the observation that "Polynesian scholars are under great obligations to Mr. C. J. Lyons for the translation of it" (Lyons, C. 161), and although this could conceivably be referring to scholars who were Polynesian, the far more likely audience is white scholars studying Polynesia.

As for the most massive translation project prepared during this time, the writings of Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau, which eventually filled four separate volumes, Martha Beckwith explicitly described it as "not for popular consumption, but in order to put into the hands of ethnologists who do not read Hawaiian or who have no access to the original text, a version as nearly literal as possible of Kamakau's text" (qtd in Nogelmeier 126). The most well-known and influential historian of his time, Kamakau had himself written in 1865 for the nūpepa *Ke Au Okoa*, that:

> He makemake ko'u e pololei ka moolelo o ko'u one hanau, aole na ka malihini e ao ia'u i ka mooolelo o ko'u lahui, na'u e ao aku i ka moolelo i ka malihini (1)
>
> ['I want the mo'olelo of the sands of my birth to be correct; it is not the foreigner

[23] Kanaka scholar and poet Brandy Nālani McDougall gives an in-depth reading of the reasoning behind Lili'uokalani's translation and its aloha 'āina bent in her article "Mo'okū'auhau versus Colonial Entitlement in English Translations of the Kumulipo."

who shall teach me the moʻolelo of my people, I shall be the one to teach it to the foreigner.']

Unfortunately, though his reputation as the go-to historian continued on after his work transitioned into English via translation, that same process of translation ensured that he would likely no longer consider his moʻolelo pololei, as the malihini, those American scholars and folklorists for whom he was translated, then took control over disseminating and teaching "his" moʻolelo.

Here we will examine briefly a few of the translations produced primarily, but not exclusively, during the first half of the twentieth century to see how this extractive model of translation produces a version of Hawaiian history vetted by Kamakau's "foreigners," how the translators effaced their interpretive presence by claiming to practice "literal" translation, and how through their framing, these translations unavoidably portrayed Hawaiians, our language, and our culture as dead or dying. Puakea Nogelmeier's *Mai Paʻa i ka Leo* and other works go into detail about the contexts in which the originals and the translations were created. I will focus on how the supposedly well-intentioned process of translation proved to be so detrimental to the ea and mana of Hawaiians.

A major justification offered for many of these translations is that because the numbers of Hawaiians, and especially knowledgeable ones, are declining, soon no one will be left who can understand the meaning of these texts. For foreign specialists on Hawaiʻi, while the loss of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi might be regrettable, and the disappearance of kānaka Hawaiʻi might be sad, the loss of the embedded knowledge, the real material for their research, would be absolutely unconscionable. Not surprisingly, then, rather than trying to push for the renormalization of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, as Hawaiians were calling for in the nūpepa and legislature, or deciding that they should learn Hawaiian, and therefore pushing for the republication of the ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi versions of the moʻolelo, the scholarly community exhorted translators to go into salvage mode. This rationale and its underlying assumptions were already flourishing during the kingdom. Referring

to the original of his translation of "He Mele no Kualiʻi," C. J. Lyons remarks that the mele "is so antique in language, construction and imagery, that very few of the natives at the present day can understand much of it" (161). Similarly, Thomas Thrum stresses the value of Fornander's text by explaining "these tales [cannot] be secured from original sources today. The bards, or haku mele, and chanters have passed away, and even those capable of interpreting the mele and antiquarian subjects are few" (Fornander *Vol 4* 2). And many years later, anthropologist Katharine Luomala describes Kamakau producing his own text at a time "when the customs and beliefs of 'the people of old' were still remembered" (501), even though many of these traditions were still being practiced, and much of the history he offers was in the living memory of his contemporaries, and especially his own.

They participate in the colonial dream of the disappearing native, which rests firmly upon the foundations of a teleological understanding of culture, where the more "enlightened" the natives, the closer they have progressed toward the telos of Euro-American society. That natives will disappear is therefore only proper, because *as natives* they have no place in the modern world. As a result, the value of their knowledge has nothing to do with the survival of their culture or themselves. Rather, it contributes to the project of constructing a universal history of modern—read "Western"—societies that accounts for how they have successfully risen out of such "primitive" ones (Medicine 2001; Deloria 2004; Tuck and Yang 2012; TallBear 2013).

In Hawaiʻi, this extractive model of translation has led to what Puakea Nogelmeier has called a translated canon of literature, made up of David Malo's work translated as *Hawaiian Antiquities*, John Papa ʻĪʻī's[24] columns from the Hawaiian-language newspapers translated as *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, Kepelino's manuscript translated as *Kepelino's Traditions of Hawaiʻi*, and Samuel Kamakau's voluminous newspaper contributions translated as *Ruling*

[24] Marie Alohalani Brown's biography of John Papa ʻĪʻī entitled *Facing the Spears of Change: The Life and Legacy of John Papa ʻĪʻī* provides a powerful look at his extraordinary life and a closer look at the translation of his work.

Chiefs of Hawai‘i, The People of Old, The Works of the People of Old, and *Tales and Traditions of the People of Old*. (Abraham Fornander's work is sometimes considered part of this canon, though his status as a haole scholar complicates matters.) Before the relatively recent resurgence of scholars who insist on using Hawaiian-language sources to research Hawaiian topics, these translations were all you needed to consult if you felt it necessary to include "the native voice":

> Within the setting of English primacy, certain contextual factors helped to generate and foster the cumulative power of the Hawaiian canon. These factors include the relative vacuum of Hawaiian resources into which the English texts emerged, the imprimatur of the presenting institution, an absence of contradiction or disagreement between the texts, and the apparent authority of the individual authors and texts themselves. Each of these four factors became and remained applicable as translations were published and the canon developed over a period of 80 years. (Nogelmeier 45)

Nogelmeier discusses at length how the systematic translation of these texts eliminated explicit and sometimes fundamental disagreements between their authors. With such a cohesive and relatively narrow picture of Hawaiian culture at hand, scholars only capable of working in English were hardly motivated to look outside.

If we count only the indigenous authors, the translated canon consists of 1,542 pages of content, including paratextual materials such as tables of contents, introductions, indexes, and so forth. From the kingdom era through to the mid-twentieth century, roughly 100,000 pages were published in Hawaiian-language newspapers, with each page representing between eight and twelve 8 ½ x 11 manuscript pages. The translated canon is therefore a miniscule fraction of this output, but its supposed synecdochic relationship to the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i written archive has predictably resulted in numerous, significant, and repeated misrepresentations and misunderstandings of Hawaiian history, worldview, and culture. And as was the case with both

the Bible and the legal system, misguided understandings of the process and product of translation have had very detrimental effects on Hawaiians. As I hope has become clear by now, translation is necessarily a highly interpretive act. Its practitioners bring all of their linguistic capabilities and cultural knowledge, along with inevitable ideological and aesthetic biases, to their chosen texts, which they re-interpret and re-author for a new audience. But in the popular understanding, translation is a mechanical process, which translation theorist Gayatri Spivak has aptly and dismissively described as "the stringing together of the most accurate synonyms by the most proximate syntax" ("Translating" 93).

By their very nature, mechanical/technical operations of this sort supposedly cannot be ideological or political—one reason perhaps that at least some people uncritically trust machine translation such as Google Translate. Chapter Three described how translation into Hawaiian could act as a kind of consecration—a process through which Hawaiians bestowed further value on what they thought worthy. Something similar occurs when ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi is translated, but the results are also reversed. In *The World Republic of Letters*, Pascale Casanova describes how translation consecrates or canonizes literary works from the "periphery" status within the colonial centers:

> Translation is the foremost example of a particular type of consecration in the literary world. Its true nature as a form of literary recognition (rather than a mere exchange of one language for another or a purely horizontal transfer that provides a useful measure of the volume of publishing transactions in the world) goes unrecognized on account of its apparent neutrality. (133)

For Casanova, the colonial "center" is Paris, but similar power imbalances between Hawaiian-language texts and mainstream English-language sources mirror this center/periphery model.

In her account of the creation of what she calls a "legendary Hawaiʻi" through the deployment of folklore, Cristina Bacchilega also refers to the consecratory nature of translation: "Often perceived as faithful or innocent documentation paradoxically *because* they are

translations, these texts go unquestioned in the Western context and become the dominant representations of colonized peoples" [emphasis hers] (14). In the case of the Hawaiian-language canon, such translation has helped to construct what Houston Wood has called "monorhetoric"—a singular, linear, empirical understanding of the past, with no room for varying explanations of the world (129). Wood argues that Hawaiians viewed, and continue to view, their cultural productions as a "polyrhetoric," with "multiple, shifting, and context-specific meanings" (129–130). Eric Cheyfitz also understands this widespread colonial process of creating the history of an indigenous people through translation as a struggle between the univocal and the equivocal (155). Taking Native American cultures as his subject, Cheyfitz describes the Anglo-European system of belief as dedicated to the domination of a single voice. The kinship-ordered societies that this domination clashed with in America, however, were "equivocal." Though often hierarchical in terms of rank or status, numerous voices were taken into account.

Univocality and monorhetoricity stand in stark opposition to the Hawaiian understanding of moʻolelo getting more mana, in the sense of power, through having more mana, in the sense of multiple branching versions. This fundamental distinction is often lost in translation through the process of consecration. During the more than a century long history of the Hawaiian-language newspapers, at least thirteen different versions of the story of Hiʻiakaikapoliopele were published (hoʻomanawanui 5%), and none were presented as more authoritative than the others. In fact, author and translator Joseph Poepoe gave this explanation as to why his version of Hiʻiaka being published in *Kuokoa Home Rula* in 1908 was a little different from the version that was published in *Ka Na'i Aupuni* in 1906:

> O keia mau aui hou e ikeia ia ana mai keia puka ana mamuli o ka loaa hou ana mai i ko makou mea kakau moolelo, he Hiiaka i kapaia o ko Maui Hiiaka ia. O ka mahele Hiiaka mua i puka ai ma KA NAI AUPUNI, a i hoomaka ai nohoi ma keia pepa ma ia manawa no, ua olelo o ko Hawaii Hiiaka ia.

> ['These new variations that will be seen in this publication are because the author has just come into the possession of a Hi'iaka called Maui's Hi'iaka. The first version of Hi'iaka that appeared in *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, and which actually began in this paper at that time, is said to be Hawai'i's version of Hi'iaka.]

No attempt is made to declare which one is better or "right"; Poepoe seems more excited about presenting the new version than determining which is the "real" one.

The monorhetorical and univocal representations created by the canonical/extractive translations of Hawaiian texts became so dominant, however, that they almost obscured the originals themselves from even the translators. When Bacil Kirtley and Esther Mookini critiqued an earlier translation of Kepelino's "Hoiliili Havaii" that they had just retranslated, they argued that "to translate certain portions of his text into their mere literal English equivalents would be an evasion, for the Hawaiian language remains basically a spoken tongue" (40–41). In 1977, when they were writing this critique, the Hawaiian alphabet had been formalized for *one hundred and fifty years*, at least one hundred Hawaiian-language newspapers had come and gone, and Hawaiians had achieved a higher literacy rate in their own language than virtually any other people on earth. Even more confusing is that only three years prior, Esther Mookini herself had published a slim volume entitled *The Hawaiian Newspapers*, which contained a statistical record of those nūpepa, several indexes, and a brief history of newspaper publishing in Hawai'i. Perhaps the quoted statement can be attributed to Kirtley, which may shed light on the power dynamics of their writing relationship. But the Western cultural assumption that 'ōlelo Hawai'i had to be primitive, with no real written form, is apparently so strong that it can cause even scholars who know better to discount or ignore Hawaiians' highly developed literary traditions.

Though the translated canon texts were not the only texts to be translated into English from Hawaiian during that time, they were influential enough to set the mode in which the vast majority of other translations would be performed. Correctness was a major component. Any understanding of translation as a mechanical, and therefore "innocent" process leads translators

and readers to think in terms of right and wrong. And while there can certainly be a wrong translation because of simple misinterpretation, the range of meaning, history, and cultural context that inheres in words and phrases means that there can never be just one "right" translation. As the philosopher and translator José Ortega y Gasset explains, "since languages are formed in different landscapes, through different experiences, their incongruity is natural" (51), and even when translation theorists claim that only "proper names, geographic, scientific and technical terms, days of the week, months, and numerals have full lexical correspondence in several languages" (Visson 57), they are still on shaky ground. Hawaiians for instance have different systems for keeping track of days and weeks, and even different ways of counting, based on groupings of 4, 40, 400, 4,000, 40,000, and 400,000.

Yet this kind of "full lexical correspondence" is the very thing that is implied when translators claim to have carried out a "literal" translation. They are claiming that they are on the straight-and-narrow; they are not interpreting, merely "carrying across." But translators who use the term "literal" often have completely different practices in mind. It could be keeping the syntactic order of a sentence. It could be using short words for short words and long for long. When readers see the word "literal," however, they understand it to mean that the translation is a "good" one, which gives only the "actual" meanings of the words. When translators claim that their work is "literal," they therefore appear to such readers as technicians, switching out words accurately and objectively, rather than as arbiters of interpretation, whose assumptions, methods, choices, and values create very particular kinds of translations.

It is therefore no surprise that the extractive model of translating Hawaiian claimed to be literal, and went unquestioned for so long. All the translators believed they were creating "good" and "right" translations. When introducing her version of Kaluaikoʻolau's moʻolelo, for instance, Frances Frazier claims that she has tried to "follow as literally as possible the language of the original with all its richness of poetry and pathos" (x). Sometimes the assertion comes from others: Kenneth Emory called Mary Kawena Pukui's translation of John Papa ʻĪʻī's work "literal"

(xii). As for Kamakau's text, much of the translation produced by a committee of scholars including Mary Kawena Pukui, Thomas G. Thrum, Lahilahi Webb, Emma Davidson Taylor, John Wise, and others (Kamakau *Ruling* v) was deemed "incoherent" by Martha Beckwith and Mary Kawena Pukui, who then edited it (Nogelmeier 126). Yet Dorothy Barrère and Katherine Luomala both called the result "*completely* literal" [emphasis mine] (*Ka Po'e* vii; Luomala 501).

Though all of these translations would at some point become available for public consumption, scholars and scientists were still the primary audience for these translations, so the idea of transparency—the attempt to erase the presence of the translator—contributed to the sense of authenticity surrounding these translations. The less the translator was present, the more easily the translation would be seen as giving direct access to the original source material. A good number of the problematic effects of these translations did not even come from the translators themselves, but in the way that editors and publishers presented the translation. The more mechanical or literal that editors and publishers claimed a translation to be, the more authority it therefore had. For this reason, readers were often unaware of many silent changes or additions made to the text. For example, *Hawaiian Antiquities*, the translation of historian David Malo's work, provides a great deal of valuable information and commentary about traditional Hawaiian society and practices. But while Malo is certainly critical of some traditional practices, many of the derisive "insights" are actually Nathaniel B. Emerson's. And because they are not attributed to him, or distinguished from Malo's text, these additions become part of the translation. Take for example David Malo's descriptions of the gods and goddesses worshipped by women. The Hawaiian text reads:

> 16. Eia no na 'kua i hoomana maopopoia e na wahine, o Lauhuki, ke akua o na wahine, a o Papa o Hoohoku ko kakou kupuna, ke akua o kekahi poe, o kapo, o pua, ko kekahi, a o ka nui o na wahine, aole o lakou akua, he noho wale iho no (Malo *Ka Moolelo* 62).

Now, paraphrasing Emerson's own words, here is how the passage could read:

> 16. The following deities were objects of definite special worship by women: Lauhuki, the akua of women. Papa and Hoohoku, our ancestors, were worshipped by some. Kapo and Pua had their worshippers. The majority of women, however, had no deity and just worshipped nothing.

Though I have added a few words to insure that everything in the Hawaiian text is accounted for, this translation largely reflects the original. But, here is what actually appears in Emerson's "translation" of Malo:

> 16. The following deities were objects of definite special worship by women: Lauhuki *was the patron deity of the women who printed tapa cloth. Pele and Hiiaka were the deities of certain women*. Papa and Hoohoku, our ancestors, were worshipped by some *as deities*. Kapo and Pua had their worshippers. The majority of women, however, had no deity and just worshipped nothing (Malo, *Hawaiian* 82). [Emphasis mine]

Emerson has added the italicized portions, and though they may seem relatively minor changes, there are still several of them. Imagine this practice employed across the entire manuscript—because it is. The first addition, an explanatory note regarding Lauhuki, could be considered helpful. The second bit is entirely new to the passage, however, and wrong: Pele and Hi'iaka were not only worshipped by women. But since Emerson's factual mistake is masquerading as the words of the historian David Malo, whose in-depth knowledge of and training in Hawaiian traditions were legendary, this "fact" about Pele and Hi'iaka worship is likely to go unquestioned, and especially by readers who cannot read the Hawaiian-language originals. The translation's textual apparatus actually makes the situation worse. Since the edition includes clearly-marked notes and commentary by Emerson and W. D. Alexander, the reader naturally assumes that everything in the translation itself comes straight from Malo. Which it does not.

Another silent change affects the ordering of material in the translation in Kamakau. Cristina Bacchilega, folklore and translation scholar, describes one of the main tenets of colonial translation as follows:

> With translation from colonized languages, it is instead common for the target language—English in the cases I discuss—to dictate its cultural logic. The rewriting that all translation involves is best driven in colonial translation by discursive strategy of containment or domestication that requires re-writing the other in the dominant language's terms. This violation is "epistemic" in that the colonized or Native world is recoded in terms of the colonizers'. (14–15)

For the most part, Kamakau's newspaper columns produced a continuous narrative, following the lives and genealogies of different ali‘i or delving into particular practices in ways that made sense to him and his readers, while steadily filling out the mo‘olelo he was trying to tell. Translation shattered and reassembled that narrative. "Recoding" it into a more palatable and comprehensible form for Western audiences, the editorial committee divided up narrative. Those parts considered history went into one book, called *Ruling Chiefs*; parts considered cultural practice went into another, *Na Hana a ka Po‘e Kahiko: The Works of the People of Old*. Material considered to be about cultural belief went into *Ka Po‘e Kahiko: The People of Old*, with the leftovers deposited in *Tales and Traditions of the People of Old*. To make this happen, individual sentences were moved and reordered, resulting in content from completely different issues of the newspaper now sitting next to each other, as if placed there by the author himself.

Again, these changes are not indicated in the text. The foreword of *Ka Po‘e Kahiko* somewhat vaguely and dishonestly remarks that "The material has been rearranged to provide a continuity of thought, with the original newspaper sources footnoted" (Kamakau *Ka Po‘e Kahiko* viii). It is true that the general newspaper source is noted, but the reordered individual sentences are not noted. Even if a sentence comes from an issue two weeks later, it is still noted as being a part of the issue into which it was moved. In a review, Katharine Luomala

mentions this, but as an improvement: “Kamakau jumped about at times from subject to subject and the new arrangement gives continuity” (502). Such recoding is commonplace in translations produced in colonial situations, and serves to erase differences between the colonizer and the colonized. This may sound like a benevolent act, striving for equivalence between the two, but it is in fact one of the most pervasive, damaging, and continuing aspects of translation. Indigenous and other peoples under the threat of colonization were and are not understood as having *fundamentally different* ways of relating to each other and the world at large. So Kamakau’s work did not for example have its own internal logic and continuity, but “jumped around.” Once again, such erasure re-places indigenous peoples into linear models of historical and cultural development for which European and American societies are at the telos—the glorious end of the line. Rather than functioning as a completely different society, or following a different line, or maybe even inscribing a circle, indigenous communities become absorbed into the grand and very linear history of “human culture” (Kirch).

Sandra Bermann, in her introduction to *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, points to the issue at the heart of this erasure of difference:

> If we must translate in order to emancipate and preserve cultural pasts and to build linguistic bridges for present understandings and future thought, we must do so while attempting to respond ethically to each language’s contexts, intertexts, and intrinsic alterity. (7)

Extractive translations from ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i were explicitly about emancipation, preservation, and communication; what was missing was the ethical response and the acknowledgment of intrinsic alterity. We saw these lacks at work in chapter two, when judges and other administrators translated something like “‘āina” into “real estate” and “property,” stripping away all familial connection to the land, and turning it into a commodity, which outsiders then had no qualms about swooping in to purchase when the maka‘āinana left it unclaimed, further seeing this lack of self-interest or “initiative” as proof that Hawaiians were less developed and ignorant

(Kuykendall *Vol I* 289–290). Claiming indigenous beliefs are the same as Western beliefs has even more global results. When “aloha” is translated as “love,” a truly poor substitute, Hawaiians are then expected to act and react *exactly* as the colonizers would, as if the way they love something is the way that we aloha something.

Entombed in Translation

Forcibly translating Hawaiians into a teleological model of development demands their relegation to the past. If our culture was dissimilar from Euroamerican culture, it was either because we had not yet reached their stage of cultural development, or perversely retained those practices that made us inferior. Either way, we were still culturally embryonic, an immature culture who had no real place in the present. The editors of Kamakau’s translations betrayed this belief through another silent global change. If reordering the sequence of events supposedly strengthened “continuity,” this second change, at least for Hawaiian tradition, denied it entirely. Especially when describing cultural practices, Kamakau is very careful about tense in his writing. Many sections are in present tense because people are still performing the activity (Nogelmeier 193–94). Hawaiians were farming kalo when Kamakau wrote about it, when his account was translated, and when we read it today. And yet, in translation, his description of growing kalo and creating ‘ai is entirely in the past tense (Kamakau *Works* 31–36). In her foreword to *The Works of the People of Old: Na Hana a ka Po‘e Kahiko*, Dorothy Barrère, who edited the translation of Kamakau for publication, acknowledges that “Some aspects of the older Hawaiian culture were already abandoned or were fast disappearing by Kamakau’s day,” but that “some were still very much alive.” She even notes that “Kamakau often differentiated in his text by the use of past and present tenses.” But with the sweep of an editorial pen, she confesses that “we have *for the sake of conformity* used the past tense almost exclusively” [my emphasis] (v-vi), relegating Hawaiian cultural practices to the past. Through this meticulous

practice, virtually every sentence of the translation reinforces a belief that Hawaiians, our language, and our culture, are dead.

How translations of Hawaiian appeared on the page could also sustain the myth of the dead or disappearing native, with no place in the modern world. The Loeb Classical Library is a renowned series that publishes facing-page translations—original on one side, English translation on the other—of Greek and Latin texts. Initiated in 1912 under the patronage of banker and philanthropist Amos Loeb, and dedicated to "making the Classical world, its literature and its *realia*, accessible to more than the specialist" (Horsley 37), according to its US publisher, Harvard University Press, The Loeb Classical Library "is the only existing series of books which, through original text and English translation, gives access to all that is important in Greek and Latin literature" ("Loeb"). Jacketed in the appropriate color—red for Latin, green for Greek—the affordable volumes became highly influential, setting the model for what a series of antiquarian texts should look like. Annotations and critical texts guided and enlightened readers, and the facing-page translations were a major innovation—at least in English:

> The significance of the parallel text format needs to be underscored, since it is so characteristic of the LCL series that it can be taken for granted today. To translate Greek texts into Latin had long-established precedent; and translations alone were also common well before the Loeb series began. But to provide the original text and a translation into the vernacular had hitherto only been done in a concerted manner by the French. (Horsley 39)

As fewer and fewer modern scholars were able to read Greek and Latin, they too began to turn to the Loeb Classical Library, though they had not been its initial audience.

And that's what the Hawaiian translation canonical texts were meant to be. With the Loeb Classical Library model in hand, the predominantly haole scholars of Hawai‘i began to recreate through translation "all that is important" in Hawaiian literature. Some, such as Beckwith's translation of Kepelino or the collected works of Abraham Fornander, actually

reproduced the facing-page presentation and the annotations. Others restricted themselves to the critical apparatus and annotations, leaving the ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi behind. But together, the translated texts adhered to the Loeb stated goal: a series in which "our entire classical heritage is represented . . . in convenient and well-printed pocket volumes" ("Loeb"). Though not perhaps designed for the pocket, the result was a handy selection of moʻolelo, chosen by foreign scholars as fully representative of our knowledge and existence, entombed within facing-page antiquarian caskets, offered as memoria of a people who have faded away into the anonymity of the universal "human culture" (Kirch).

At the time, like Classical Greek and Latin, Hawaiian writing of the nineteenth century was seen as the substantial residue of a dead language. Publishing the Hawaiian translation canon was therefore erecting the tombstone for a nearly dead people. Much of their ʻike would now survive—not as a living and growing knowledge, but as terminal objects of study. Encasing the Hawaiian translations in Loeb-like apparatus also raised their status as texts. Since Greek and Latin were widely considered as the progenitors of well over two thousand years of human culture, placing the translated Hawaiian texts in similar garb would implicitly argue that they too represented a lineage of knowledge—some "1,400 years of human culture" (Kirch). What was actually elevated, however, was neither Hawaiian knowledge/language, nor Hawaiians themselves, but the study of Hawaiʻi as a branch of academic inquiry. En-Loeb-ing the Hawaiian translations foregrounded the antiquity of the knowledge found in the original texts, justifying a continued relegation of Hawaiians to the past.

As I have suggested, in some cases, it was the editors who as part of their efforts to impose order and improve readability "fixed" Hawaiian culture in the past. But the translators had their own biases, and the common belief that Hawaiians were of the past, not the present, informs many of their word choices. For a clear illustration of such "primitivizing," let's return to Nathaniel B. Emerson's translation of David Malo. The third chapter of his manuscript is entitled "Ke Kumu Mua o ko Hawaii Nei Kanaka" (Malo *Ka Moolelo* 4), which means roughly "The

Origins of the People of Hawai‘i.” Emerson offers “The Origin of the Primitive Inhabitants of Hawaii Nei” (Malo *Hawaiian* 4), placing his assessment of Hawaiian culture fully on display.

Robert Morris presents another example of how damaging colonial ideologies drove translations. In a letter published in *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, Kapihenui, the author of the 1861–1862 “He Mooolelo no Hiiakaikapoliopele,” took issue with a different serial about Pele and Hi‘iaka written by P. W. Kaawa, which attributed a cluster of three mele to Pele. Kapihenui insists they were actually composed by Kahuakaiapaoa, a male, for his male lover Lohiau. But when Thomas Thrum translates Kapihenui’s letter, despite its explicit reference to the couple as aikāne, Kahuakaiapaoa somehow becomes a woman, so that the relationship is no longer between members of the same sex (Morris 12). Though I disagree with most of Morris’s conclusions, I entirely agree that Thrum mistranslated the letter, and most likely on purpose. The Hawaiian is simple enough, and Thrum’s command of the language was formidable. He was not confused. Though discussing a different set of circumstances, in his groundbreaking *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*, André Lefevere offers some handy advice for evaluating these kinds of translation “choices”: “Here is a possible rule of thumb: Isolated deviations are mistakes; deviations that can be shown to follow certain patterns indicate a strategy the translator has developed to deal with the text as a whole” (109). Thrum is heir to the missionary strategy of bowdlerizing any Hawaiian sexuality or pilina that did not fit their very narrow and unimaginative view of the world.

Another strategy often found in extractive translations is consigning Hawaiians and other native peoples, whether considered as the authors or the subjects of the text, to the realm of the natural. No matter how highly developed, complex, and sustainable our societies might have been, when Westerners did not see what they understood as signs of development—fences, wooden-framed houses, acceptable clothes, a codified set of laws, individual rights, and so on—as people we are portrayed as artless or primal. However intricate the kinship systems were that distributed resources and regulated behavior, native people were just “naturally” friendly or

giving. Hawaiian congeniality was stamped on our faces, for as Captain King reported in his journal, “many of both sexes had fine open countenances, and the women in particular had good eyes and teeth, and a sweetness and sensibility of look, which rendered them very engaging” (Cook 519). Visitors also noted an innate articulateness. No matter how much time, work, tradition, and expertise went into creating a strong speaker, Hawaiians were just “naturally” eloquent—a fortunate accident of language and character, rather than any training or effort. In an obituary of George Pilipo, the famed legislator and orator known as “The Lion of Kona ʻĀkau,” his white eulogizers noted that “among a nation of born orators he excelled” (“The Late”). Though a highly educated man who had honed his speaking skills through years as a teacher and decades as a legislator, he was really just one of the better examples of a people who were born that way.

Indigenous people were also assumed to be passive carriers of culture. For example, oftentimes the closest thing native people had to what outsiders regarded as literature was the oral tradition, which was seen as only consisting of things like legends, folktales, and songs, but nothing that took any artistry or authorship. Though individual tellers and performers heavily edit, alter, and compose their narratives, they are treated as receptacles and informants for scholars, rather than actors who create and continuous reinvent their traditions. Eighty years after Hawaiians took up alphabetic literacy, the translators approached their chosen texts as data, rather than as the product of native authors. In the foreword to the 1959 translation of John Papa ʻĪʻī’s work published as *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, the pioneering anthropologist Kenneth Emory stated that ʻĪʻī’s writings “provide a sound basis for reconstructing *early Hawaiian life*” and “supply considerable information.” This static understanding of culture presumes that someone hundreds of generations from its beginnings still has direct access to its character. What is especially striking here, however, is that one of the most prominent Hawaiian intellectuals, historians, and public figures of the nineteenth century was not an author, but an informant—a source of unfiltered information that the Western translator will

analyze, organize, and evaluate. And indeed, the title page of the first few published editions of the translation announced that these were *Fragments of Hawaiian History* "as recorded by John Papa Ii."

Thomas Thrum describes Abraham Fornander creating his collection "with a corps of native helpers of known ability (notably S. M. Kamakau, the historian; J. Kepilino [sic], and S. N. Haleole)" (Fornander *Vol 4* 2). At least Kamakau is listed as a historian here, although this might be merely to distinguish him from Kēlou Kamakau, another Hawaiian scholar often described as an artless informant as well. In any case, these far more experienced and knowledgeable Hawaiian peers are presented almost as if they were Fornander's graduate students. As for Kamakau's own work, in a cover blurb for a more recent printing of the translation *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai'i*, anthropologist Patrick Kirch presents him as a scribe: "Samuel M. Kamakau painstakingly recorded the oral traditions and histories of the Hawaiian people prior to the sweeping cultural changes of the later 19th century." In O'ahu Cemetery, Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau's gravestone reads "S. M. Kamakau 1815–1876 He Kuauhau-Historian." "Kuauhau" is connected to mo'okū'auhau—genealogy and lineage. But it is also how we identify a historian—someone who knows the genealogies that inform so many of our mo'olelo. His gravestone therefore reminds us not only who he was, but that he was himself part of the lineage of people who knew our mo'olelo and mele, who held our genealogies and told our stories. Historians, in short, though actually much more. Yet these translations would not have you remember him as such.

Finally, as Puakea Nogelmeier has noted at length, as a group, the most substantial twentieth century translations of Hawaiian create the impression that they have preserved the only texts that matter. Speaking as a translator, I recognize that publishing any substantial Hawaiian text was a huge undertaking, requiring the combined efforts of the translator or translators; the editors, copyeditors, reviewers, and layout and design staff; and the printers, marketers, and distributors as well. So I can understand why such a narrow range of

translations were produced, and as major Hawaiian literary figures, Kamakau, Malo, Kepelino, and ʻĪʻī were certainly legitimate choices, although Kahikina Kelekona, Joseph Poepoe, Solomon Peleioholani, Haleole, Moses Manu, and still others would have been as well. But a closer look at who was selecting these texts for translation, and mandating their Loeb-inspired, dead-language presentations reveals the settler colonial underpinnings of this era of extractive translations.

All of the canon of Hawaiian translations were published by the Bishop Museum. Founded by Charles Reed Bishop in 1889 in honor of his wife, the late Bernice Pauahi Bishop (Creutz 15), who through her will founded Kamehameha Schools, by 1898, the year William Brigham transitioned from curator to director, membership on the museum's Board of Trustees seemed to require previous service on the Committee of Safety that overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy. Sanford B. Dole was president, William O. Smith was his vice-president, and Samuel Damon was a trustee. In the subsequent Provisional Government and "Republic," Dole was president, Smith was attorney general, and Damon was minister of finance (Siddal 121, 133, 367). W. D. Alexander, the Department of Education head who felt that the extinction of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi would benefit Hawaiians, was serving as a museum trustee when the translation of David Malo was published (Malo *Hawaiian* 18). Albert F. Judd, Jr., son of the Supreme Court justice who had participated in the overthrow, was also a trustee, and served several terms as president of the Board (Siddal 225). These were the admistrators of the institution largely responsible for creating the textual picture of Hawaiian history that persists today. The very people who overthrew the kingdom and jailed Hawaiians for speaking out against them were presiding over the institution that decided which Hawaiian-language texts would be translated to represent Hawaiians as a people. Not surprisingly, none of the texts chosen were Hawaiian-language accounts of any of the political turmoil that the trustees themselves had helped foment.

The specific arm of the museum that chose and translated the actual texts came to be known as the department of Anthropology, whose mandate, as former museum director Edward C. Creutz explains, stems from the original Deed of Trust which stated that the museum should be developed "as a scientific institution for collecting, preserving, storing and exhibiting specimens of Polynesian and kindred antiquities, ethnology and natural history . . . and the publication . . . of the results of such investigation and study." (14–15) The language here makes the understood status of the translations clear. They are artifacts—specimens and antiquities for study and exhibition. For this reason, while Fornander's work on Hawaiian folklore appeared as volumes 4, 5, and 6 of the *Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum of Polynesian Ethnology and Natural History*, Volume 1 was devoted to traditional featherwork, a key to native birds, and a discussion of traditional stonework. Volume 2 focused on mat and basket-weaving, home construction, and carving. Volume 3 was about making kapa. After the three volumes of Fornander's collection and writings, Volume 7 published more notes on featherwork and then a monograph on Hawaiian lobelia. Mo‘olelo are therefore bracketed by discussions of pieces in the museum's collections—or its gardens. All are treated as remnants of a bygone Hawaiian era. Small wonder, then, that Dorothy Barrére would feel comfortable casting an entire book on cultural practices in the past tense. Since the people themselves were not long for this world, this verb shift would soon be accurate. Similarly, though a great number of the mo‘olelo by such authors as ‘Ī‘ī and Kamakau were eye-witness accounts of contemporary events, the translation titles emphasized their antiquity. ‘Ī‘ī's mo‘olelo became *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, and three of the four Kamakau translations feature the phrase "the people of old" in their titles.

Translating Tūtū: Mary Kawena Pukui

For several of the early years, the only person with a Hawaiian last name listed as museum staff was Thomas Keolanui, a janitor. Soon, however, two Hawaiian women appeared,

although despite the breadth and depth of their knowledge, Lahilahi Webb was a “Guide to Exhibits” (Gregory 4), and while she later became an associate in Hawaiian culture, and despite her scholarly pre-eminence, Mary Kawena Pukui never held a position of leadership, though her aversion to the spotlight may have come into play as well. Often referred to as Tūtū Pukui, she became the greatest Hawaiian scholar of the twentieth century, and was the equal or perhaps even the better of many of the most prominent authorities of the kingdom as well. And translation occupied a great deal of her time. The acknowledged translator of John Papa ʻĪʻī and a major contributor to the project of translating Kamakau, her many shorter translations on topics ranging from place names to sharks to moʻolelo to cloud lore make up the museum’s Hawaiian Ethnological Notes collection.

Her largest contribution to translation, however, was undoubtedly the Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian dictionary. Regarding her role, her co-author Samuel Elbert wrote that “The new dictionary is Mary Kawena Pukui’s book. . . . She is the expert in Hawaiian. This is her dictionary, a monument to her. My task has been the humble one of technician” (14). Indisputably the most important tool in the ongoing movement to revitalize and renormalize ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, before the advent of the online dictionary, few of us seeking to learn our language could be found without our dictionary almost at all times. It is also a stellar translation dictionary. Entries for Hawaiian words supply much more than a one or two word gloss, regularly providing context and examples of usage. To take one example, the entry for “kū,” a particularly versatile and supple word in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, is 863 words long. Besides drawing on her own vast knowledge, Mary Kawena Pukui was so diligent in seeking out further examples that almost anyone trying to translate a particularly obscure word in a passage will at some point discover that her dictionary entry offers that exact passage as an example.

While the achievements and legacy of Mary Kawena Pukui deserve several volumes of coverage and even praise, the reason she is being brought up here in such a limited capacity is because many of her amazing contributions as a translator were constrained by the institutional

confines of the fields of academic study that dealt with ʻike Hawaiʻi, and by the Museum administrators and trustees, some of whom had been partly responsible for the language decline and loss of Hawaiian national identity that Mary Kawena Pukui's work has ultimately helped so much to reverse. Though some of her projects, such as the collecting of ʻōlelo noʻeau, or Hawaiian sayings, she initiated herself, the translations she produced or worked on were chosen and overseen by anthropologists. The Kamakau project, for instance, was initiated in 1923 by the Historical Commission of the Territory of Hawaii, with John Wise supplying the first translations (Nogelmeier 123), and much of the HEN collection resulted from individual requests from museum-affiliated scholars looking for more information about their chosen fields of study, whether heiau, or mele, or fish.

I am not denying the significance of her contributions as a translator, which surpass all others. What I am pointing out, however, are the institutional restrictions and biases she had to navigate, many of which remain hidden. For this reason, we should not exempt her translations from scrutiny and critique, just because she produced them. Some years ago, I worked on a book entitled *Ka ʻOihana Lawaiʻa: Hawaiian Fishing Traditions*, a Mary Kawena Pukui translation of an early 20th century moʻolelo about Hawaiian fishing techniques written by a Lahaina judge named Daniel Kahaulelio. I was assigned to check the accuracy of her translation, editing it as appropriate—which at the time felt like a blasphemous act. We enlisted Gabby Kawelo, whose family had fished Kāneʻohe Bay for generations, to help us understand the described techniques. We soon realized that Pukui had misunderstood some of what Kahaulelio had written, and we fixed the translation. I offer this experience not as proof that Mary Kawena Pukui made mistakes, but as a reminder that no one, no matter how smart and knowledgeable, or how traditionally they were raised, knows everything about our culture, and furthermore, that the canonical and many other texts translated in the Territorial era involved a limited number of Hawaiians with limited decision-making abilities, who unavoidably helped

produce reductive pictures of Hawaiian culture intended for a limited audience of mostly non-Hawaiians.

Conclusion

The knowledge and tools Mary Kawena Pukui left for us are the foundations for erecting sound representations of our culture. Her legacy, and those of her forebears and contemporaries, have nurtured the beautiful resurgence of our culture, language, and historical understanding, and made it possible to take ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi and our moʻolelo to places we never imagined, and especially back to our young, whom we are educating in immersion and culture-, language-, and ʻāina-based schools. But today, a few decades on from the Hawaiian Renaissance, what role does and should translation play? Prior to the surge in Hawaiian-language learning in the 1970s, the lāhui itself relied on the limited picture of Hawaiian history/culture supplied by the extractive translations of the early twentieth centuries, often without understanding how much translation and editing had misrepresented or altered the Hawaiian texts. But now, when thanks to our own forebears more of us can read the originals, and up-and-coming generations of kānaka once more claim ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi as their first language, what role should translation play in shaping the future of our lāhui? During the twenty years I have been a translator, I have certainly seen the need for translation from English to Hawaiian decline. We have not yet reached a place where making our moʻolelo available through translation to our people and those who would stand with us is no longer needed, but as we have seen throughout this dissertation, the ea and mana of our lāhui require different approaches and responses from translators and translations, as our own needs and the political and cultural contexts change. In the next chapter, we shall see how aloha ʻāina are crafting their own responses to translation, to meet those changing needs.

CHAPTER 5: "I DON'T WANT TO TRANSLATE": THE GENERATIVE POWER OF REFUSING TRANSLATION

A sunburned man in the gallery yawned. None of those gathered in the worn red seats surrounding the House floor really wanted to hear about protecting lifeguards from liability, but that was part of the business of government. It was a staid session, with none of the tense arguments that had accompanied the passage of HB1, the Hawai'i Marriage Equality Act, the previous year, or the hushed tones of ethics violations discussions. It was just another unremarkable Tuesday in March, maybe a little cooler than normal, but not by much.

Representative Sharon Har, from the Kapolei district, a suburb outside of Honolulu, gave her testimony. All was going smoothly until John Mizuno, the House Speaker, called on Faye Hanohano, the Representative from Puna, a district on the island of Hawai'i known for its connections to our volcano goddess and a fierce Hawaiian pride.

With her fuzzy blue sweater with white sequined embroidery around the edge, and a flower over her right ear, the 61-year-old former prison guard looked like any other aunty out for the day. She took a breath, and said:

"Mahalo, luna ho'omalu 'ōlelo. Kāko'o loa. Makemake au i ka ha'i 'ōlelo o ka luna maka'āinana mai Kapolei mai e komo i loko o ka puke hale luna maka'āinana."
An irritated but patient Mizuno responded,

"Rep. Hanohano, could you please translate for the members?"
Hanohano replied, "'A'ole au e makemake e unuhi. I don't want to translate. Mahalo."

Clearly annoyed, Mizuno called for a recess, banging his gavel and tossing it down. When he returned, he announced indignantly that "Rule 60.1 provides members should conduct themselves in a respectful manner." But an outspoken critic of Hanohano's jumped to her defense, reminding the Speaker that Hawai'i has two official languages, and that the Representative from Puna was well within her rights to speak Hawaiian on the House floor.

Mizuno responded that it was not the Hawaiian that was disrespectful, but that she refused to translate.

Faye Hanohano: "I Don't Want to Translate"

All of the upset in the House and the subsequent sensational coverage resulted from Hanohano's saying—and to be honest, not even in especially strong Hawaiian—what any other representative might have said: "Thank you. I am in favor of the bill. I appreciated her speech, and I'd like it to go into the legislative register." But in Hawaiian. And she had already been under fire for how she interacted with staff of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, and for allegedly using racial slurs about haoles and Asians in her comments about the need for more Hawaiian artists in the public art program, so there was a relatively large public outcry after this story broke. News outlets more sympathetic to Hawaiian causes said there should be Hawaiian-language interpreters available at the Legislature. Others called that a waste of time and money. None of the articles suggested that the other legislators should learn Hawaiian themselves.

As we have seen in the last two chapters, after the overthrow, the Hawaiian language was increasingly deinstitutionalized. ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi, however, has been an official language of the state for four decades now, dating back to the Constitutional Convention of 1978, though this has resulted in little more than being able to (sometimes) write checks in Hawaiian. Neither the lawmakers or state institutions have adopted ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi in any meaningful way, but this inaction is hardly surprising, when we look at some of the comments made in the aftermath of Hanohano's decision not to translate.

While the online comments section of any news outlet is often a den of hate and vitriol, the remarks from folks who are not obvious trolls can sometimes shed light on opinions held by some people in the community. Debates around language use in areas (mistakenly) considered part of the United States catch afire very quickly, and often reveal powerful anger directed

towards those who speak a language other than English. In a Trump-led political climate, even in places known to be more familiar with and accepting of multi-lingualism, speaking languages considered to be immigrant or minority tongues can provoke verbal and sometimes physical attack. Numerous online videos and accounts display angry monolingualists lashing out at someone merely for speaking a language other than their own (Fermoso; Little). As earlier chapters have shown, language engenders and reflects identity in ways that few other qualities seem to do. The life and death of a person or culture are contained within their language, and encountering a different tongue means entering another world, where you are uncertain of the terrain, or the depth of the seas. Without such knowledge, it is hard to know your place in that world, and when someone is used to a particular place in the social hierarchy, that lack of knowledge grates.

Writing at length, a commenter named jusanopinion101 angrily denounced Hanohano:

> General practice when speaking to a group of people is to utilize the more common language the majority understands. This B S of acting out like a little child isn't in the best interest of "We the People" she is supposed to be representing. It is considered rude to "refuse" a translation, especially when it would be translated to a language the majority would understand. . . . Simple case of MANNERS. Not childish behavior instead of being an effective politician. Any place else in the world it's called, "MANNERS". . . . Not all the people speak Hawaiian. They are the minority. It's called representing the people and making sure the hawaiian voice is heard and making sure the English voice is heard. Not just hawaiian. Do you really pay her to do less than half a job? or are you paying her to do 100% of a job?

That Hanohano in one instance refuses to translate one sentence somehow means that all of a sudden, only the "Hawaiian voice" is heard—as if she has marginalized those who speak English. Infantilizing her for her refusal, in the rest of her comment, jusanopinion101

types “MANNERS” in capital letters four more times, clearly outraged by the incivility she sees in Hanohano’s refusal to translate. This focus also suggests that jusanopinion101 considers the larger monolingual American culture to be the “host,” and that Hanohano’s lack of manners is disrespectful. She is not abiding by the house rules.

Though she used fewer capital letters, Louise Raitano Smith was even more offended:

> So Rep Hanohano is saying . . . f-you if you don't understand me. This is not a way a representative of Hawaii should express ones’ [sic] self no matter what her feelings are. Go to Zippys and talk story in Hawaiian if you wish . . . but when it comes to THE HOUSE Floor you owe all people of Hawaii a translation no matter what language you’re speaking. ‘Playground’ bullying is how I see it. I thought we had standards for that in our classrooms.

Again, in a realm featuring English 99.9% of the time, the person who speaks the endangered language near collapse only a handful of decades ago is somehow the one bullying everyone else. Because people in positions of relative power seldom like to be confronted with their own ignorance, this brief moment of not knowing becomes amplified into being under siege by an entire power structure implicit in a marginalized language wielded by a bully. It is also telling that Zippy’s and “talking story” are the only things that ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is good for, marking both a racial and class element to the argument.

Calling Hanohano childish and a playground bully not only relegates ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i to a child’s realm, but also reinvokes those teleological models of development so popular with the missionaries and their descendants. In the 1901 legislature, the first of the Territory, the haole politicians and the executive branch not only placed Hawaiian legislators as lower on the teleological/evolutionary scale for insisting on speaking ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, but characterized them as less than human. Governor Dole insisted that the Organic Act clearly required the use of English

during official government business, and the haole press depicted the Hawaiian legislators as a group of monkeys swinging through the trees, complete with a caption from a Rudyard Kipling poem: “Jabber it quickly and all together! Excellent! Wonderful! Once Again! Now we are talking just like men” (Williams “Race” 26, 27).

Opinions about Hawaiians speaking their language in public have apparently not changed much over the past hundred years. Still other commenters on the Hanohano incident remarked “America last time I looked. Translate” (Holman), called Hawaiian a “dead language” (Campbell), and suggested that “you’re better off speaking simlish [the pseudo-language used in the video game *The Sims*] at that point, because at least then other people can chime in” (Tabag). This is why it is important that Hanohano, and Kahoʻokahi Kanuha and Kaleikoa Kāʻeo, two Hawaiians we will discuss later, take the stands they do. By refusing to translate, they make themselves and us legible as Hawaiians. Too many people in Hawaiʻi have bought into the idea that this is “America last time I looked.” But it really isn’t America and they haven’t really looked. But in their Hawaiian fantasy, our ʻōlelo is dead, and video game gibberish is more relevant than the language of the ʻāina.

This chapter will focus on how in certain situations, refusing to translate is an affirmative insistence on legibility *as* Hawaiians, fighting against assimilation into a settler colonial system predicated on removing kānaka from ʻāina—what Patrick Wolfe has termed “elimination” and what Kēhaulani Kauanui has characterized as “the elimination of the Native as *Native*” (9). It is vital that we refuse to treat translation as an innocuous or mechanical act. The truth is that translation, and the withholding of translation, make legible the terrain where some of our lāhui’s most important battles are taking place. Paying attention to translation reveals what is at stake. The insufficiency of identity when wrapped up in the monolingual cogs of the settler colonial machine, and the willful ignorance and fear of the unknown that ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi and Hawaiians more generally provoke, stand in stark relief when you focus on the stutters and starts of the translational flow. As we have already seen and will continue to see throughout this chapter,

language is an especially volatile issue for the larger public in Hawai‘i. When that quality is strategically wielded to fight against elimination, particularly through the withholding of translation, so many possibilities for different kinds of engagement open up between the cogs in the machine. So much light shines through. Whether they want to be or not, bringing people to consciousness about ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i necessarily raises all the related issues swirling around language.

Like many other indigenous communities, we see the beautiful things that our people are doing: restoring the productivity of our ‘āina, spreading our ‘ōlelo to places where it hasn’t been heard for over a hundred years, creating beautiful music and poetry, carrying our culture into new media, and standing against reckless development. We also see the problems of health, racism, domestic violence, economics, incarceration, and houselessness in our community, and part of our cultural revitalization is looking for Hawaiian solutions to these problems. But once outside of our own community, we must often confront how mainstream Hawai‘i sees us: violent, ignorant, ungrateful, anti-intellectual, inauthentic, whiny impediments to progress, trapped in the past and trying to pull everyone down with us, and perhaps most attractively, still disappearing—in short, all those qualities encountered repeatedly in the previous chapters, and which other indigenous folks will immediately recognize as components of their own reputation in their own places as natives.

Though often seen as reactionary by the mainstream, saying no to translation is paradoxically affirmative. Speaking of indigenous communities on Turtle Island, the renowned Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar, writer, and artist Leanne Betasamosake Simpson writes that “we need to not just figure out who we are: we need to re-establish the processes by which we live who we are within the current context we find ourselves” (*Dancing* 17), and it is through the refusal to participate in certain acts of translation that we put ourselves on the track to reestablish some of those processes that Simpson mentions. According to language scholar Mary Louise Pratt, “languages disappear only through being displaced by more powerful

languages, which by one means or another (mainly by schooling) succeed in interrupting the steady passing down of languages from older to younger speakers" (246). It is really this interruption that is being refused. It is a refusal to believe that English has more mana than ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, that it gives us more ea. Pratt also observes that "all languages belong to their speakers in a way they do not belong to everyone else." This is true. But as the acts of refusal we will discuss in this chapter also make clear, ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi belongs to this land in a reciprocal relationship, each caring for the other. Those who feel connected to this ʻāina are well-served to feel connected to this language, this ʻōlelo, as well.

What became very clear after the Hanohano incident, when even the most supportive media outlets were calling at most for interpreters at the legislature, was that a good proportion of the public continues to believe that Hawaiian exists only to be translated. The commenters' and commentators' general agreement that ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi has no social relevance unless translated and made legible to them amounts to a demand as always that the minority must make concessions so that the majority can remain as they are, their knowledge of their place in the world as seen through English unchallenged. This demand takes the assumptions underpinning the discourse of sufficiency and extractive modes of translation to their extreme but logical conclusion. Not just the original text, but the original language is no longer seen as necessary.

I often encountered this attitude when talking about my work on a project digitizing the Hawaiian-language nūpepa into a searchable database. Even though the result will grant profoundly improved access to arguably the most important Hawaiian-language repository, and even though sustained research in this archive has already transformed Hawaiian scholarship, the first question was almost always "when are you going to translate them all?" And when I replied that the goal was making the nūpepa available *in Hawaiian*, my respondent would usually offer an uninterested "cool, cool," before changing the subject. Given the unprecedented access to instant knowledge via the internet, making the newspaper database available only to

those who have put in years and even decades of work learning ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi without some twinned effort to make everything in the newspapers accessible to the general public is unthinkable. But the current fights over translation make very clear that while Hawaiians are trying to nourish and sustain in Leanne Simpson words' "the processes by which we live *who we are* within the current context we find ourselves" [emphasis added], the tenets of settler colonialism and contemporary media access at the other end of the spectrum demand that everything Hawaiian, including ʻāina, be available to all for unrestrained consumption. Refusing to translate therefore implicitly insists that *who we are* is different from who you *say* we are.

Translation theorist Mona Baker writes that

> undermining existing patterns of domination cannot be achieved with concrete forms of activism alone (such as demonstrations, sit-ins, and civil disobedience) but must involve a direct challenge to the stories that sustain these patterns. As language mediators, translators and interpreters are uniquely placed to initiate this type of discursive intervention at a global level. (30)

In the cases I am examining here, however, what challenges the dominant narratives is the *refusal* to mediate. Rejecting who you *say* we are is rejecting the certain kind of "recognition" offered by settler colonialism that, through enclosing Hawaiians into the box of being just another ethnic group in Hawaiʻi, brings us ever nearer to elimination, though as we shall see later, elimination looks a little different here in Hawaiʻi. There are times that the ideas of resistance and refusal themselves have been critiqued in our community for being too reactionary, too much of a response rather than a proactive step. But Leanne Simpson, who was also one of the engines behind Canada's Idle No More movement, argues that "movement building is a productive or generative politics of refusal when we are building and reinvigorating and embodying and amplifying our instance of acting as peoples who belong to specific Indigenous nations. We are creating the alternative on the ground and in real time" ("Misery").

Here in Hawai‘i, those refusing to translate engage in “movement building” in Simpson’s sense by connecting their actions to those generative acts of refusal occurring in the kingdom and what followed it at the nineteenth century’s turbulent end. In the wake of the overthrow in 1893, the great statesman and newspaper author and editor Joseph Nāwahī helped to found the Hui Aloha ‘Āina, a group committed to preventing annexation and restoring the queen to her throne, and with his wife Emma also started and ran the newspaper *Ke Aloha Aina*. His most celebrated speech, delivered to 7,000 people, maka‘āinana and ali‘i alike, at Palace Square a year after the overthrow, was a stunning call for refusal:

> He mea hauoli no’u ko’u ike ana aku ia oukou e o’u hoa makaainana ua hooko mai oukou i ka leo kahea a ko oukou mau alakai, no ko oukou akoakoa ana mai i keia ahiahi. Oiai hoi, no kakou ka Hale (Aupuni) e like me ka na Kamehameha i kukulu ai; aka, i ka la 17 o Ianuari, 1893, ua kipaku ia ae kakou e ka poe i aea hele mai, a komo iloko o ko kakou hale; a ke olelo mai nei ia kakou e komo aku a e noho iloko o ka hale kaulei a lakou i manao ai e kukulu iho a onou aku ia kakou a pau e komo aku. O ka’u hoi e olelo aku nei ia oukou, e o’u hoa makaainana, *mai noho kakou a ae iki*. [emphasis added] (“Haehae”)
>
> [‘It gladdens my heart to see all of you, my beloved fellow citizens. You have answered the call of your leaders, gathering us all together this evening. This house of government belongs to us, just as the Kamehamehas intended; yet on the 17th of January, 1893, we were kicked out by wandering trespassers who entered our house, and they are telling us to go and live in the lei stand that they thought to build and shove us into. But what I have to say to you, my beloved people, *we must not dare to assent in the slightest!*’]

Reminding his Hawaiian audience of their history, he calls on them to refuse to be a part of the present the foreigners are thrusting upon them. But what Nāwahī is calling for, *mai noho kākou a ‘ae iki*, does not forbid action, but rather demands that Hawaiians live the alternative, creating

it on the ground in real time, and continuing to bring a Hawaiian future into being. A lei stand is not the place for our beloved people; the house that the Kamehameha lineage built definitely is.

A few years after Nāwahī's speech, another event resonates with those who in our time have recently refused to translate. Both the Hui Aloha ʻĀina and the Hui Aloha ʻĀina o nā Wāhine, the latter run by the formidable Kuaihelani Campbell and Emma Nāwahī, participated in arguably the most unified act of refusal in Hawaiian history. Liliʻuokalani called Campbell and Nāwahī's hui one of the "societies much dreaded by the oligarchy now ruling Hawaii" (*Hawaii's* 304). The haole-led provisional government responsible for the overthrow and the eventual Republic of Hawaiʻi had their eyes fixed on annexation to the United States. In 1897, Emma Nāwahī suggested to Kuaihelani Campbell that both Hui Aloha ʻĀina draft a petition, in Hawaiian with an English translation, rejecting the annexation being proposed to the US government (Silva *Aloha* 194). Hui Aloha ʻĀina members hustled throughout the pae ʻāina, acquiring the signatures of men, women, keiki, kūpuna—anyone against the overthrow and annexation. Large and small community meetings were held, and organizers headed out across the islands, urging the lāhui to sign. And sign they did.

The best documented meeting took place at the Salvation Army Hall in Hilo, because Miriam Michelson, a writer for the *San Francisco Call*, found herself in a hall that held 300, with an even larger crowd gathered outside. In her article "Strangling Hands Upon a Nation's Throat," Michelson vividly describes what took place—all of it relayed through an interpreter. "This land is ours—our Hawaii." Emma Nāwahī, said to those gathered. "Say, shall we lose our nationality? Shall we be annexed to the United States?" The crowd shouted out its refusal: "'Aʻole loa! ʻAʻole loa!" [ʻNever! Never!'] Kuaihelani Campbell then inspired those listening, and also ended her remarks with a question:

> Stand firm, my friends. Love of country means more to you and to me than anything else. Be Brave; be strong. Have courage and patience. Our time will

> come. Sign this petition—those of you who love Hawaii. How many—how many will sign?

As she spoke, she raised a gloved hand, showing that her signature would stand as a refusal of the United States. Then, when she asked how many would join her, "in a moment the palms of hundreds of hands were turned toward her." The people of Hilo spoke with their words as well as their upraised hands, one man crying out from the back: "I speak for those behind me. They cannot come in—they cannot speak. They tell me to say, 'No annexation. Never.'"

"There are 100,000 people on the islands," Michelson wrote, "Of these not 3 per cent have declared for annexation. To the natives the loss of nationality is hateful, abhorrent." The petition made this abhorrence clear: 21,000 men and women out of a population of 40,000 signaled their refusal on the Hui Aloha ʻĀina petitions (Silva *Aloha* 150).[25] In Washington D.C., representatives of the Hui Aloha ʻĀina formally presented the petitions to members of Congress. The treaty failed to pass (Silva "1897"). The following year the United States dropped all pretense of a treaty and "annexed" Hawaiʻi through the Newlands Resolution, a joint resolution of Congress that skipped a plebiscite and required only a simple majority vote to pass. But the massive act of refusal now known as the "Kūʻē Petitions" reverberates through our history and into the current day, inspiring those who would refuse translation and the United States' dominion alike.

In June of 2014, the Department of Interior (DOI), somewhat out of the blue and on very short notice, issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking to hear from the public "whether and how the Department of the Interior should facilitate the reestablishment of a government-to-government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community" (Office of Native Hawaiian Relations *Advance*). As Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua explains:

> It was the first time the U.S. government held any public hearings in Hawaiʻi on federal recognition in well over a decade. At the fifteen DOI-led sessions held on

[25] Another group, the Hui Kālaiʻāina, also gathered 17,000 signatures on their own petitions.

> six islands that summer, Kānaka packed auditoriums and school cafeterias in standing-room-only crowds. Speakers were limited to just three minutes of testimony each, and voices poured out like rain on a thin metal rooftop, even though advance notice on the proposed rulemaking had been issued only days earlier. (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua and Kuwada 4)

More than a century after the Hilo meeting, the vast majority of those voices, including those of the two kānaka to be discussed shortly, responded to DOI's questions in the same way: "'Aʻole loa! 'Aʻole loa!" ['Never! Never!'].

A common critique of the ideas of resistance and refusal in our community comes in response to the often-heard cry to "kūʻē!" (resist/protest/oppose/stand apart) with "kūʻē i ke aha?" meaning to "kūʻē against what?" Implicit in the question is a judgment that resistance and refusal are too amorphous, not directed enough, essentially just us Hawaiians being disagreeable. The thing that those who ask "kūʻē i ke aha" are missing out on, however, is that even if Hawaiians were taking the stance of kūʻē just to be disagreeable, just to act out, just to scream and shout, those acts of defiance would still be grounded in refusing the erasure that comes from existing within colonial structures. These acts of refusal are generative because as Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson argues, "Refusal comes with the requirement of having one's political sovereignty acknowledged and upheld, and raises the question of legitimacy for those who are usually in the position of recognizing: What is their authority to do so? Where does it come from? Who are they to do so?" (11). This points to how these acts of refusal can have effects on the everyday existence of kānaka. Hanohano's refusal to translate—and as we will see, Kahoʻokahi Kanuha's and Kaleikoa Kāʻeo's—makes the lāhui Hawaiʻi legible as a sovereign entity by questioning the legitimacy of "those who are usually in the position of recognizing." Even though these issues seem to be exclusively about language, by forcing questions about the State of Hawaiʻi's authority and its source, they are inevitably forcing the discussion back to ea Hawai'i, what gets translated as Hawaiian sovereignty.

Pua Aiu of the State of Hawai‘i’s Department of Land and Natural Resources, a major participant in the events that led to the arrests of Kā‘eo and Kanuha, wrote in 2010 about the power at work when refusing to translate from ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i:

> Ultimately, however, the choice not to translate strengthens the position of the Hawaiian language. Since you cannot understand Hawaiian without understanding the Hawaiian worldview, perceptions about land and culture are forced to change. When this happens, how we think and speak—‘ike and ‘ōlelo—also change to accommodate the worldview that goes with the Hawaiian language. While this change is slow, over time there is a definite shift. Like the movement of a tsunami or a phalanx of soldiers, changes in worldview are subtle, patient, and inevitable. (105)[26]

Although “subtle” and “patient” aren’t the first words I associate with “tsunami,” Aiu’s belief that incorporating a Hawaiian worldview will change perceptions and language is strong. Unfortunately, for such desired change to occur, those being refused translation must decide to go deeper and find out more. And as the many of the online comments related to the Hanohano incident suggest, some people—and after twenty years in Hawaiian language revitalization efforts, I have concluded that “many people” would be more accurate—believe that ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is something best kept at Zippy’s, or in the mouths of children on the playground. That means it is entirely possible that untranslated ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i would just be skipped over and ignored as something unimportant, beneath notice. That is why it is so important that these refusals to translate take place within the legislature, the body responsible for passing and amending laws, and within the purview of the court system, the settler colonial state’s body for enforcing those laws, and therefore the elimination enforcement arm.

---

[26] For more discussions of translation coming from within the Hawaiian community itself, the Editors’ note from the first issue of *‘Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal* contains a conversation between Māhealani Dudoit, Nohealani Kawahakui, Lisa Kanae, Laiana Wong, ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, Leslie Stewart, Michael Puleloa, and Noelani Arista that covers a wide range of topics but also focuses on different approaches to understanding translation.

Recent public refusals to translate, and the potential stakes for those refusing, have forced people to think about something that they have probably never had an opinion about before. Many who have lived in Hawai‘i for years, and even decades, feel they “know” this place, “know” Hawaiians, and “know” *the* culture. Whether they ever engage with Hawaiians meaningfully or not, their time spent here makes them feel entitled to that knowledge. Tourists even feel they “know” Hawai‘i after a few years in a time share, two weeks at a time. As for Hawaiians, they are “known” as musicians and dancers, and more recently, perhaps as scholars and protestors. It is therefore unsettling when Hawaiians refuse to allow themselves to be known, to be accessed, and the sputtering knee-jerk reactions, unfounded fear, and anger found in online comments indicate that something important is happening when a refusal to translate cuts off access to supposed understanding.

I would suggest that such refusals threaten to cut off untroubled participation in the settler colonial world that the online commenters and much of the general public have come to “know.” Since settler colonialism plays a central role in my analysis of translation and refusal, we should examine briefly to what degree its theoretical application fits the specific case of Hawai‘i. As Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang state in their well-known article “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor”: “Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain” (5). Appropriation and possession are constants:

> Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article). Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound

> epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. (5)

In the Hawaiian kingdom era, these aspects of settler colonialism and the logic of elimination are not so clear. The massive influx of American citizens and plantation labor did not really accelerate until the last decade of the monarchy, and the earlier arrivals did not exactly fit the settler profile. (Chinese plantation workers, for instance, intermarried heavily with Hawaiians, and the Chinese ancestry population hovered in the mid 20,000s for several decades [Schmitt 121].) It was during the Territorial Era that the key element of "settlers coming with the intention of making a new home on the land" really fell into place. One statistic tells much of the story. The number of Hawai'i residents born in the United States rose from 4,294 in 1900 to 128,952 in 1960 (Schmitt 121).

These demographics, and the fact that a Hawaiian ruler was on the throne until 1893, could lead to the conclusion that the tumultuous 1890s turned an indigenous nation into occupied settler colonial state. If however the operations of settler colonialism "are not dependent on the presence or absence of formal state institutions or functionaries" (108), as Patrick Wolfe suggests, and if Kēhaulani Kauanui is correct in saying that "the logic of elimination of the Native is also about the elimination of the Native as *Native*" (9), then perhaps some aspects of settler colonialism were at play in the kingdom. This is a fine line to walk. None of the Hawaiian governmental structures were dedicated to the physical elimination of Hawaiians. But when we follow Kauanui, and look at assimilative biocultural structures, things become more complicated.

What really helps to expose the complications of settler colonialism in Hawai'i is the understanding of translation developed over the previous chapters. Paying attention to its workings over time not only offers insight into the mechanics of settler colonialism, but also suggests strategies for constructing especially powerful modes of resistance and decolonization. Translation has been variously described as assimilating and domesticating or

as alienating and "foreignizing." Many of the political, cultural, educational, social, and legal structures of the kingdom operated on a parallel spectrum: some disciplining Hawaiians to become more like Westerners; others enabling or even requiring Hawaiians to remain, or even to become, more "foreign" to Western values by retaining a certain native-ness. But just as the domesticating/foreignizing spectrum is only a rough guide for conceiving of translation, the same holds for its usefulness in understanding the kingdom institutions in their interactions with colonialism, settler or not. As already noted, the lāhui Hawai'i appropriated Western technologies for their own purposes. Alphabetic print literacy, for example, became a weapon to resist the encroachments of U.S. imperialism and a tool for transmitting and preserving traditional Hawaiian thought and values inhering in mele, mo'olelo, and other modes of expression.

A comprehensive study of how settler colonialism, with its logic of elimination, infiltrated the Hawaiian kingdom is not possible here. But any serious look at the historical sequence starting from the Bayonet Constitution, then passing through the overthrow, Provisional Government, Republic, and into the Territory, will detect the operations of "settler sovereignty," as the "settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies" (Tuck and Yang 6), with the eventual illegal annexation the clearest possible example of the logic of elimination at play. Joseph Nāwahī's exhortation to *mai noho kākou a 'ae iki* and the Kū'ē petitions are conscious and vehement refusals of a future in which Hawaiians would no longer be legible *as Hawaiians*.

But the logic of elimination is complicated in the case of Hawai'i. The settler state undeniably took deliberate steps to eliminate native autonomy by attempting to sell off lands appropriated from the kingdom, by directing its educational efforts toward Americanizing Hawaiians in manner and language, and by the other expected colonial moves that commonly take place in an occupied nation. But for other compelling reasons, the survival, and even high visibility, of Hawaiians was of the utmost importance—most obviously within the developing

tourist industry. As Jennifer Lynn Kelly says in her study of representations of Palestine, "tourism often facilitates and disappears past and present colonial violence" (726), so it should not be surprising that in 1903, three years after the Organic Act made Hawai'i a US territory, and the last year of Sanford B. Dole's term as its first governor, the Hawaii Promotion Committee, which became the Hawaii Tourism Authority in 1915, began marketing Hawai'i as a visitor destination (Teves 714).

Hawaiians then became a crucial ingredient that would sell the image of Hawai'i as an idyllic paradise where available brown women and men cater to colonial and touristic desires. As Lani Teves explains in her analysis of the deployment of a particular kind of aloha to further state interests: "With tourism as Hawai'i's primary economic base and aloha as its so-called gift to the world, the performing bodies of Kānaka Maoli (Hawaiian)—or whoever can pass as 'Hawaiian'—became necessary" (713). What was unnecessary to this image, however, were Hawaiians on their own land or in positions of power. Teves also discusses how translation played a crucial factor in the state and tourist industry's deployment of aloha as a seductive opiate for the visiting masses. She foregrounds the missionary translation of aloha as synonymous with the love of God, accomplished through a "comingling between the 'ancient traditional' meaning of aloha, a Polynesian concept, and its Christian translation" (707). I would however suggest that the push for translation also arose from a strong desire to tame the power of aloha 'āina that drove Hawaiians to fight literally and figuratively for the lāhui prior to the Territory, a desire that leads to translating aloha as something closer to "no make trouble" and "turn the other cheek."

Hawaiians are thus granted a special but limited status as the originators of the aloha spirit and therefore what makes Hawai'i unique, but the logic of elimination operates as the boundary of what is considered "the aloha spirit" in the touristic sense, meaning what tourists can be convinced is authentically Hawaiian, or in the political sense of Hawai'i as "the aloha state." When Hawaiians do however step outside of their roles as happy-go-lucky locals or

ambassadors of aloha for lobster-red tourists, the logic of elimination silences them by stripping their access to needed financial or natural resources, and then shaming them into reassuming their prescribed role. In fact, the tourist industry will proactively try to hide Hawaiians who aren't displaying the proper aloha spirit. When 10,000 Hawaiians marched down Kalākaua Avenue in Waikīkī, peacefully protesting the planned construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea (Terrell), many tourists reported that the staff at their hotels told them to avoid the area completely.

Though it may be hard to pinpoint when the settler version of colonialism became dominant in Hawai'i, its power was fully on display during the Hawaiian Renaissance of the '60s and '70s, when we were reclaiming our identities *as Hawaiians* in the struggles over Kalama Valley, the Chinatown evictions, Sand Island/Mokauea, and Waiāhole. Reclaiming the narrative of Hawaiian-ness from the tourist industry and the state also meant reviving and reclaiming how we understood and translated aloha. The greatest spur to this embrace of "aloha 'āina" as practiced by our kūpuna during the kingdom era was the movement to stop the bombing of Kaho'olawe. We were reminded of how adding "'āina" to "aloha" created something much fiercer, something that resisted the bounds of translation placed on "aloha" by the settler colonial tourist industry. Even the voyage of *Hōkūle'a* was at its core about how we understood the Hawaiian relationship to land. And refusing to be eliminated, Kanuha and Kā'eo both ended up in court over issues arising from their restored translation of aloha as intimately connected to 'āina.

The framework of settler colonialism also provokes a critique of how all aspects of the state enact or support the further alienation of kānaka from 'āina. As Turtle Mountain Ojibwe scholar Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark explains, "settler colonialism doesn't just try to eliminate but in its place, seeks to actively produce something new. In their attempts to 'eliminate,' or at least significantly diminish Indigenous political authority, the United States and Canada also sought to produce their own legality by reframing their criminal activities as lawful" (n.p.). That framing of

the United States as “lawful” here in Hawai‘i enables them and their local proxy, the State of Hawai‘i, to act as the source of law. Even though Hawaiian traditional and customary rights are said to be an accepted part of State law, the State of Hawai‘i is the translator of those rights and customs, being the final determinant of their scope and applicability. As for the “lawful” carceral arm of the State of Hawai‘i, its court and prison system is arguably the institution that most blatantly enacts “the multifarious procedures whereby settler-colonial societies have sought to eliminate the problem of indigenous heteronomy through the biocultural assimilation of indigenous peoples.” Indeed, political scientist Robert Nichols argues that these agents of state violence should be seen “as *constitutive* of territorialized sovereignty in a colonial context rather than extraneous and novel” [emphasis in original] (447).

At its base, the way the prison system connects to dispossession is geographic and thus connected to ‘āina. As Ruth Wilson Gilmore notes, “Incapacitation [in prison] doesn’t pretend to change anything about people except where they are” (14), and Nichols explains that “this apparatus of capture operates as one armature of territorialized colonial sovereignty, a continuous process of dispossession that (always imperfectly) undermines indigenous practices of self-government by severing peoples from their historical relationship to the land” (452), meaning that the carceral arm of the state tries to empty the signification of aloha ‘āina as a fierce and powerful connection that drives Hawaiians to action and replace it with one in which aloha is translated as unconditional giving by the “host culture.” For those who refuse that retranslation vehemently enough, incarceration echoes those past geographical relocations that many indigenous peoples suffered when outsiders with the force of law behind them began clearing their lands ancestral lands for settlement. As Hawaiian scholar David Maile puts it, “policing Kānaka ‘Ōiwi is a precarious performance of U.S. settler sovereignty in Hawai‘i—a spectacle attempting to piece together jurisdictional authority and territorial control.” Quite conveniently, the carceral state apparatus not only takes indigenous people away from their land and human connections, but also, in the cases of Standing Rock, the Unis’tot’en Camp,

and others in the past few years, away from the frontlines of land protests. The ever-accelerating militarization of the police is also at times linked to indigenous resistance, which becomes "the rationale and justification for the development and application of greater colonial control over Indigenous bodies and lands" (Stark).

Kahoʻokahi Kanuha and Kaleikoa Kāʻeo have both been arrested multiple times at sites of land struggles—sometimes even the same site. But the two examples discussed in this chapter stem from their arrests at two different but related land struggles which led to their rejection of the state's attempts to translate aloha ʻāina as a passive part of the settler colonial narrative. To these kānaka we now turn.

Kahoʻokahi Kanuha: "The Translator is for You"

In 2015, one of the most intense land struggles in Hawaiʻi came to a head when Hawaiians and other allies physically blocked the construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope atop the 13,796 foot-tall Mauna Kea. One of the most important and powerful ʻāina in Hawaiʻi, Mauna Kea is filled with mana and celebrated in mele and moʻolelo. Using the mauna for astronomy has been controversial from the moment University of Hawaiʻi acquired its 65-year general lease in 1968 (OHA v. State of Hawaiʻi 10), with public concern growing steadily over UH's 50-year tenure as manager of the mauna. In 1975, The Audubon Society stalled construction of the United Kingdom's submillimeter antenna ("History"). Three state audits were conducted; the first was a scathing indictment of both UH's and the state's (via the Department of Land and Natural Resources) mismanagement ("Timeline"; OHA v. State of Hawaiʻi 12–16). In 2005, a court-ordered Environmental Impact Statement concluded that 30 years of astronomy activity had caused "significant, substantial, and adverse" harm ("Timeline"). And for years, a small but dedicated group of community members has been quietly fighting UH and organizations such as NASA in court to ensure the protection of Mauna Kea.

In October of 2014, the attention and the tension became much greater. The Thirty-Meter Telescope, an 18-story building that would stretch over 5 acres of conservation district if completed, scheduled a groundbreaking ceremony. This was disrupted and eventually stopped by folks who came to be known as kiaʻi mauna, or mauna protectors. Things were quiet for the next several months, but when the work was to begin again, kiaʻi mauna camped at an altitude of 9,200 ft, holding vigil across from the Visitor Information Center. Their numbers started small but soon really picked up. On April 2, 2015, over 300 kiaʻi blocked the roads accessing the proposed TMT site; 31 peaceful demonstrators were arrested (Inefuku).

The kiaʻi had enjoyed a good amount of support to this point, but when footage of the arrests started appearing on social media, things really blew up, as images and videos of the struggles on the mauna were shared across the world. The availability and savvy use of Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram for mass mobilization, sharing practical information, and spreading editorials, petitions, photos, and videos sympathetic to the movement distinguished Mauna Kea from previous land struggles in Hawaiʻi. By the end of April, for instance, an online petition with 52,000 signatures opposing the TMT's construction was delivered to Hawaiʻi's governor. The growing reach of the kiaʻi mauna could easily be measured from the number of engagements their posts would get. In March, as the action was ramping up and people were reporting from the encampment on the mauna, their posts would get 80 to 90 likes. As the movement build over the next few weeks, kiaʻi posts would routinely attract over 1,000 likes. Though questions remain about how effective social media is at mobilizing people in general, without it, the Mauna Kea struggle would never have received so much attention.

On April 7, the Governor called for a temporary halt to construction. When it was supposed to resume in June, over 750 kiaʻi blocked TMT crews from reaching the summit, and 12 more people were arrested ("Timeline"). Seven more arrests occurred on July 31, ironically a kingdom holiday celebrating the return of Hawaiian sovereignty after a six-month British takeover, and eight more on September 9, including seven women in the midst of prayer.

Marches, banner drops, rallies, and sign-wavings took place across the islands and wherever Hawaiians could gather, including Las Vegas and California. The largest march took place in August, when an estimated 10,000–11,000 people stretched over a mile and a half through the middle of Waikīkī (Terrell).

In December of 2015, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court vacated the Conservation District Use Permit for the TMT, sending it back to the Board of Land and Natural Resources to be reconsidered (“Timeline”). After a contested case hearing, Judge Riki Amano recommended that the Thirty Meter Telescope be allowed to move forward (“Judge: Thirty”). On October 30, 2018, a 4-1 ruling from the State of Hawai‘i’s Supreme Court upheld the permit that the DLNR granted the TMT to build in the conservation district (“State”). A few legal avenues remain to stop the construction of the telescope, and this latest ruling has the kia‘i organizing and strategizing again. But since the attempted groundbreaking in 2014, no construction has taken place on the Mauna.

Though many wāhine, kāne, and māhū have stood staunchly as kia‘i, and some like Kū Ching and Pua Case have served for years, Kaho‘okahi Kanuha, a young immersion school teacher, is one of the most visible leaders. Though all the kia‘i mauna, from the veterans who have taken off time from work and taught themselves about legal procedures for their court cases, to those organizing events in support, to those placing themselves in front of the construction vehicles, deserve to be recognized for their aloha ‘āina, Kanuha’s specific relation to translation makes him our focus here. He was arrested in April and June. Those kia‘i arrested in July and September were released because the circuit court threw out the hastily implemented emergency rules banning camping on the mauna. Prosecutors also dropped charges against ten of the 31 arrested in April (“Some”), but Kanuha’s case continued to trial in 2016.

He decided to defend himself, and only spoke ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in the courtroom. His rationale was as follows:

> Hawaiian is ultimately my strongest language. It's my language of preference. It has been the primary language of my education since preschool—and I mean that all the way from preschool through elementary to middle school through high school and in through college. And so what I'm trying to do is I'm trying to—I'm trying to show that the language is alive. And it's about time that Hawaiian be truly recognized, at the very least, as an equal language to English. (Martin)

Kanuha's account of his schooling raises a major issue for those revitalizing and renormalizing ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, and especially educators. Students in immersion schools like Kanuha know that outside the circles of their family and friends, not many people speak Hawaiian. While that pushes some to become even more staunch in their language use and try to shift things, many students find it more convenient to accommodate the person who doesn't speak Hawaiian, and switch to English, but the result is the spaces where ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi can serve as the language of daily interaction shrink and shrink until it is really only at school. And while mele and hula are vitally important, our ʻōlelo should not be relegated to those "expected" realms where mainstream Hawaiʻi society "allows" ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi to be acceptable. Because Hawaiian needs to be more than a classroom or performance language, to show that it can exist in contemporary contexts, some speakers insist on using it when and wherever possible, even if it causes confusion and friction.

Kanuha's refusal to translate himself in court or to live in translation at the very least makes legible the fact that ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi is supple and modern. It also made visible the ramifications of insisting on speaking Hawaiian outside of the classroom. Unsurprisingly, Kanuha's stance of insisting on ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi outside of those acceptable areas ignited the ire of commenters in the same way that Hanohano's stance did. Or more. The comments responding to Hanohano often infantilized Hawaiians, but Kanuha pushed mikethenovice a step farther: "Waste of money litigating a dog barking." Marauders_1959 scoffed: "Speaking "Hawaiian" in a US court? Give Me a Break ! Was he also wearing native Hawaiian attire and appeared barefoot

?" We can't determine whether the quotation marks around ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi are commenting on the authenticity of Kanuha's language use, or yet another example of the extraneous or misused punctuation common in online comments. But the claim that Hawaiian does not belong in a US court is *exactly* what Kanuha is rejecting. Using ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi there not only asserts that Hawaiian belongs everywhere, but also expresses the ea (life/breath/sovereignty/rising) of the Hawaiian nation: "I—as a Hawaiian standing up for my Hawaiian heritage, for my Hawaiian nationality, for my Hawaiian identity—can defend myself in my Hawaiian language" (Martin).

Equal footing for Hawaiians in the courts and legal system was a big concern throughout the kingdom era and into the Territory, though the power dynamic was very different in terms of ea and mana. Besides the struggles over legal translation outlined in chapter two, Hawaiians with the means educated themselves in the law, and fought to preserve Hawaiian standing in the legal system. J. Kauwahi's guide to deeds and other legal contracts was the first book published by Hawaiians, and aloha ʻāina were lawyers, including F. J. Testa, Joseph Nāwahī, and especially Joseph Poepoe, who wrote many series on law, and later translated and published the decisions of the Supreme Court (Silva *Power* 110; Forbes *Vol 4* 407). During the first decades of the Territory, Hawaiians fought to preserve the right to express themselves as Hawaiians in courts of law. One of the bills in the first Territorial legislature, introduced by H. M. Kaniho, representing Kauaʻi and Niʻihau, called for ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi to remain as an option for use in all Territorial courts (Williams "Race" 32). In 1920, Z. P. K. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua, also known as Kalokuokamaile, one of the wise kūpuna of Nāpoʻopoʻo, reported that Representative Kupihea repeatedly tried to gain passage of that bill—but always unsuccessfully (3).

Indigenous theorist Audra Simpson offers a persuasive explanation for the waning ea of the lāhui Hawaiʻi and our ʻōlelo within settler state institutions during those times:

> In situations in which sovereignties are nested and embedded, one proliferates at the other's expense; the United States and Canada can only come into political

> being because of Indigenous dispossession. Under these conditions there cannot be two perfectly equal, robust sovereignties. Built into "sovereignty" is a jurisdictional dominion over territory, a notion of singular law, and singular authority (the king, the state, the band council, tribal council, and even the notion of the People). (12)

When Kanuha through ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi asserts ea Hawaiʻi in the courtroom after its long period of suppression, he is chipping away at the dominion of the U.S. as "the singular law" and "singular authority."

And whether they realize it or not, what provokes the irate online commenters is this chipping. The monolingual U.S. settler confronted by another language fears the unfamiliar and the unknown, with the more canny or more paranoid seeing that something is coming on the horizon. Settler colonialism names and orders the world so that it is legible and beneficial to settlers. Hawaiʻi is a state, ʻāina is real estate, Hawaiians are an ethnic group. Exposure to the language of this place, which orders their world differently, not only suggests how tenuous settler power over this ʻāina actually is, but also confronts settlers with their complete ignorance of how different Hawaiʻi might be from what they believe. So seeing ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, this language they feel they do not need to know, not only being recognized, but claiming authority in settler state institutions rather than being assimilated confronts them with the possibility that change is coming. And because they cannot, or simply refuse, to prepare for such change, they react violently when such personal indignities multiply until their comfortable understanding of how the world should be seems threatened by this alien language world.

One of Kanuha's especially savvy context shifts came after a Hawaiian-language interpreter was assigned for the case. The translator was not for him, he told the judge, "The translator is for you." As Kanuha explained in an interview for Hawaiʻi Public Radio, "The issue is when I speak to her she wasn't able to comprehend that . . . And so my demand to her was it's on you, it's your kuleana, it's your responsibility to find an interpreter for yourself so that you

as a judge can competently make a ruling in this case, in this trial" (Martin). The logic is impeccable. Since Kanuha understands both Hawaiian and English, but is choosing to speak only in Hawaiian, and since Judge Barbara Takase only understands English, she needs an interpreter to do her job properly. Kanuha was therefore calling on a settler colonial institution to rectify its own shortcomings at the request of someone who did not recognize the court's authority. A daring strategy, but after some initial resistance, the judge gave in and got an interpreter for herself. This was an inspiring reversal. Speakers of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi are accustomed to having our efforts to use our language outside of the classroom treated as a request for concessions, but here was a staunch aloha ʻāina dictating the terms of engagement, arguing that the court needed to catch up.

As the online commenters who denounced Faye Hanohano as childish or bullying confirm, Kanuha's refusal to translate can all too easily be seen as a refusal to communicate. Because the Latin word "translatus" means "carried across," translation is often described as a bridge that lets meaning flow across linguistic gaps. Refusing to translate can therefore seem like a desire not to communicate, a rejection of the offer to cross the bridge. For this reason, many online commenters claim that a refusal to translate shows poor "MANNERS" by rudely declaring "f-you if you don't understand me." What such online critics do not realize, or care to understand, is that refusals to translate are actually offering a bridge that the critics are more than welcome to cross, and that will carry them to something we consider beautiful and hold dear in the very core of our being. It is not, however, a bridge between Hawaiian and English, but one to a world where the language of this ʻāina is spoken everywhere. This world once existed, when Hawaiians, Chinese, British, Americans, Greeks, other Pacific Islanders—all who lived here—spoke Hawaiian. We know about this world because we know our moʻolelo. One of our most repeated sayings is "i ka ʻōlelo nō ke ola, i ka ʻōlelo nō ka make," [ʻin ʻōlelo there is life, and in ʻōlelo there is death']. The bridge we are offering is to the entirety of that life and death, but to take the first steps, you must listen to what people are saying when they don't translate.

Kaleikoa Kāʻeo: "Eia nō au ke kū nei ma mua ou"

Like Kahoʻokahi Kanuha, Kaleikoa Kāʻeo is a Hawaiian-language educator, teaching at the college level for more than 25 years (Hiraishi). He was also arrested in the Mauna Kea protests, but this chapter will focus on his arrest when protesting the Daniel K. Inouye Solar Telescope at Haleakalā, on his home island of Maui. Like the Mauna Kea kiaʻi, aloha ʻāina on Maui have been challenging the Inouye telescope in court, in this case for almost a decade (Loomis). Though its footprint would be much smaller than the TMT, it would still be the world's largest solar telescope, standing 14 stories high (Loomis). Many of the Haleakalā protesters had either been on Mauna Kea, or were inspired by what happened there, and on July 31, 2015, over 200 people blocked the base yard where a convoy was preparing to take equipment to the summit (Gutierrez). To block the convoy, they used crosswalks strategically; and a chain of kiaʻi with PVC pipe over their arms locked themselves together then lay down on the road. Twenty were arrested, but the convoy was stopped (Gutierrez). Three weeks later, eight more were arrested for attempting to block construction ("6 arrested").

The arrests on Haleakalā differed strikingly from those on Mauna Kea because the police were far more militarized. The differences were so stark that sources familiar with the planning for the State of Hawaiʻi's response to expected protests over the TMT after the October 2018 Supreme Court decision said, "They don't want another fiasco where DOCARE officers are shedding tears and embracing protesters. They want this to be like Haleakala, where they were all over 'em" (Dayton). Robert Nichols describes the nature of such a militarized police force:

> Policing is thought to be militarized either when (1) it begins to employ certain technologies of intense violence normally not deployed against civilian citizenry (e.g., the use of armed personnel carriers, drones, aerial surveillance, etc.) or (2) when it begins to serve overtly political aims, exceeding its traditional mandate to "serve and protect" the citizenry. (445)

Maui Police Department confronted the peaceful protests in tactical riot gear and body armor, but as Nichols explains, when "viewed from the vantage point of settler colonialism and indigenous critique," we can recognize that "there is nothing new" about "the nakedly fluid boundary between military and policing operations today." Within Anglo-American settler colonialism, "the extension of criminal jurisdiction has long been central to the subjugation and displacement of indigenous polities" (446). When police carry out the political will of the settler/occupying state against indigenous members of the occupied nation, the line between policing and military action becomes thin indeed, as "criminal control bleeds into war" (445).

It was in this militarized milieu that Kaleikoa Kā'eo was arrested for his part in the last unsuccessful attempt to blockade the convoy from delivering the telescope's mirror to the summit. He had lain down in the road, directly in the path of one of the trucks. He was charged with disorderly conduct, refusing to comply with an officer's order, and obstructing a highway, though later news outlets reported that the second charge was actually obstructing a sidewalk (Fujimoto). Kā'eo's staunch aloha 'āina had frequently put him in court for petty misdemeanors, often in front of the same judge, Blaine Kobayashi, and more than a dozen times he had been granted an interpreter so he could speak Hawaiian during his trial (Nabarro "Arrest"). This time, however, Kobayashi denied Kā'eo's request, and that is when things got *interesting*.

A few different media outlets released footage of the courtroom proceedings, and the following is a transcript cobbled together from those sources documenting the bizarrely performative interaction that took place:

> *Kobayashi:* "State your name for the record."
>
> *Kaleikoa:* "Ua hiki mai nei kēia kanaka 'o Kaleikoa." ['This person named Kaleikoa is here']
>
> *Kobayashi:* "Samuel Kā'eo?"
>
> *Kaleikoa:* "Ua hiki mai nei kēia kanaka 'o Kaleikoa e kū nei i mua ou, e ka lunakānāwai." ['This person named Kaleikoa is standing here before you, judge.']

Kobayashi: “I know you understand English, Mr Kā‘eo, so I’m going to have to have you please identify in fact that your name is Samuel Kā‘eo.”

Kaleikoa: “Eia nō au ke kū nei ma mua ou.” [‘Here I am standing right in front of you.’]

Kobayashi: “I don’t know what that means, Mr Kā‘eo, what you just said.”

Kaleikoa [slower]: “E kala mai, e ka luna kānāwai, ‘o au nei ke kanaka e kū nei ma mua ou i hiki mai i kēia lā.” [‘My apologies, judge, I am indeed here, the person standing in front of you on this day.‘]

Kobayashi: “I’m going to give you another opportunity, Mr. Kā‘eo, to just identify yourself, just so the record is clear. I’m going to ask you one more time, is your name Samuel Kā‘eo?” (Maui Now “kaleikoa project 2b”)

Kaleikoa: “Eia au, ke kū nei i mua ou, ‘o ia ke kanaka āu i kāhea mai nei, e kū nei i mua ou, e ka luna kānāwai. Aloha.” [‘Here I am, standing right here, the person that you have just called out for stands here before you, judge. Aloha.’]

Kobayashi: “The court is unable to get a definitive determination for the record that the defendant seated in the court is Mr. Samuel Kā‘eo. Bailiff make three calls for the defendant.”

[Bailiff calls out in the courtroom and then walks out into the hallway to call again before returning.]

Bailiff: “Three calls made your honor. No response.”

Kobayashi: “Okay, three calls having been made. No individual identifying himself as the defendant for today’s proceedings, for State of Hawai‘i vs Samuel Kā‘eo. A bench warrant be issued in the amount, Ms. Skye?”

Prosecutor: “Your honor, the state is requesting a bench warrant in the amount of $250 per count.”

Kobayashi: “So ordered.” (KITV “Haleakala”)

The stunning, almost fable-like theatricality transforms this encounter into an allegory for the Hawaiian experience with settler colonialism. It would be hard to think of a better example of the lengths the settler state is prepared to go when seeking to contain Hawaiians. A $750 bench warrant was issued for Kā‘eo due to his “failure to appear,” even though he was standing right in front of the judge, who kept addressing him as “Mr. Kā‘eo”! The judge also insisted on referring to him as “Samuel,” even though the court case lists him as Samuel Kaleikoa Kā‘eo, and Kā‘eo insisted on identifying himself as Kaleikoa. Could there be a clearer case of how the court, as a vehicle for enacting the logic of elimination, tried to erase Kā‘eo’s identity as a Hawaiian?

The public outcry was immediate and massive. Some politicians saw the court as the problem. Currently running in 2018 for governor, Representative Andria Tupola in a video posted on Facebook blasted the entire judicial staff: “The judge pretended that he couldn't hear and then the clerks played along and then the prosecutors played along. We don't go to the courts to put on a show, it's not for theatrics, it is for justice” (Nabarro “Arrest”). In his own video response, Kaniela Ing promised to push for strong legislation that would mandate a Hawaiian-language interpreter in court (Nabarro “Arrest”). Other online comments ran along familiar infantilizing lines. “BRAT I see this person behaving like a Brat, ‘it’s my ball so we will play my way’ also attempting to use the ‘race’ card, behaving like two year old,” wrote P minz, and myauthorizedopinion goes on at still greater length: “Boy was in contempt of court . . . Judge should have called it and locked bright boy up. Just call it a ‘reality check.’ . . . Boys [*sic*] lucky, he got off easy. Judge chose not to cite for contempt.’ Boy needed a reality check and ended up getting coddled instead. Poor thing.” I could go on at equal length about this comment, but by now, I don’t think readers need me to speculate on what kind of person calls a 51-year-old Hawaiian man “Boy.”

Opinions such as these to the contrary, the following day, Judge Kobayashi put out this notice:

> The Court hereby recalls the bench warrant (D211844171) issued on January 24, 2018, in the above-captioned matter. Case No. 2DCW-17-0002038 is hereby rescheduled for status, trial setting, and further hearing on the issue of an interpreter on February 21, 2018, at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 3D.

Swiftly recalling the warrant and revisiting the interpreter "issue" suggests that Kobayashi had not really thought through the performance that they had put on in his courtroom, nor had he realized how many eyes were on what was taking place there. By insisting on ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi as a required engagement on the part of the court system, Kāʻeo's and Kanuha's actions reverberate out into other arenas. By gumming up the works of the carceral machine of the settler state through their refusal to translate, they are effectively setting the stage for similar situations outside of the carceral system as well when Hawaiians who were inspired by their refusals, their reiterating of Nāwahī's call to *mai noho kākou a ʻae iki*, take their own stands, in whatever contexts their aloha ʻāina directs them to make it happen.

The Invisible Man

Kaleikoa Kāʻeo had figured out something that all little kids who loved superheroes were dying to know: how to become invisible. It turned out that all you had to do was speak Hawaiian. "Living as ʻŌiwi is a continual process of becoming," Noe Goodyear-Kaʻōpua writes, "Like breathing, resurgence and ea must be continuous to sustain a healthy life" ("Reproducing" 13). What Kāʻeo's, Kanuha's, and Hanohano's refusals to translate did was make them visible, make them *legible*, not just as minorities within the legislative or justice system, but as *Kanaka Maoli* within the grip of the representative and carceral arms of the settler state. Pua Aiu acknowledges that "Colonized people often feel they must self translate or they will not be heard. Certainly when Hawaiians refuse to translate, they often in fact are not heard" (98). And certainly in Kāʻeo's case, when he did not translate, the judge not only refused to hear him, but even pretended not to see him.

But what if the primary audience for these refusals to translate is not the court or legislature, or even the general public, but the lāhui Hawai‘i itself? Kā‘eo and Kanuha are both educators who support independence from the United States. By making themselves visible in the courtroom, they are making their values visible/legible to the Hawaiian community as well. Through the refusal to translate, they present themselves as aloha ‘āina—rooted in the land, connected to their language, and dedicated to living as part of an independent Hawai‘i. The bridge in Kā‘eo’s case goes to a Hawai‘i where Hawaiians are seen as human beings with the right to exercise our ea. As he said at a speech the day after the warrant was recalled:

> See, the idea of us being invisible is nothing new. What we witnessed in the courtroom on Wednesday is nothing new. It’s not about the judge. . . . Yes, we can point the finger at Judge Kobayashi. But even if we change Judge Kobayashi, it does not change the system of racism and settlerism that exists in Hawai‘i. It’s a systematic problem in which they silence our voices. They treat us as if we’re not human beings, and we don’t know what’s best for our people. That somehow 5,000 miles away, they know better what is sacred and what is important for us. (maui808films)

By refusing to translate for those who are literally and metaphorically 5,000 miles away, Kā‘eo’s message becomes clearer for the lāhui Hawai‘i.

As this sample reveals, and as many of the irate commenters liked to point out during Kā‘eo’s trial, Kaleikoa Kā‘eo can speak English; he is in fact one of our most eloquent and stirring orators in either language. When long ago Representative Kaniho introduced the bill calling for more ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in the court system, he really did have a hard time understanding English. Kā‘eo has no such problems, and employs both languages strategically, selecting each time the one that will resonate most with his current audience as he insists on the primacy and power of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. Nor is he alone. The championing of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is being led by those of us who are bilingual, and this why paying attention to translation, and refusals to translate,

can yield such powerful insights. Becoming visible to Judge Kobayashi is not the goal, but rather, becoming increasingly legible as a lāhui, with our own values and systems of governance. Growing our sense of indigeneity, of Hawaiian-ness, of ea as we navigate our everyday worlds is far more important than increasing the presence of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi in settler institutions, though the former can benefit from the latter.

Leanne Betasamosake Simpson speaks to this idea with regard to her own context in settler Canada:

> When my Indigeneity grows I fall more in unconditional love with my homeland, my family, my culture, my language, more in line with the idea that resurgence is my original instruction, more inline with the thousands of stories that demonstrate how to live a meaningful life and I have more emotional capital to fight and protect what is meaningful to me. I am a bigger threat to the Canadian state and its plans to build pipelines across my body, clear cut my forests, contaminate my lakes with toxic cottages and chemicals and make my body a site of continual sexualized violence. (“Misery”)

The more Hawaiians feel the strength of this unconditional love for homeland, family, culture, and language, the less they will accept their enclosure within the settler state. It is no accident that these state institutions were chosen as the sites of these translational refusals. Audra Simpson spells out why:

> The bureaucratized state is one frame in which visibility is produced, creating the conditions under which difference becomes apparent; political aspirations are articulated; and culture, authenticity, and tradition (Verdery 1993, 42) become politically expedient resources. The state, in framing what is official, creates the conditions of affiliation or distance. These disaffiliations arise from the state's project of homogenizing heterogeneity (18)

By taking back the idea of what is official—Kanuha's assertion that "the translator is for you," for instance—the refusal to translate calls into question the state's authority to set the conditions of affiliation or distance. By insisting on Hawaiian difference, these refusals also reveal *why* the case of Hawaiians should be different, why Hawaiians should stand apart.

Just as with her people, the Mohawks of Kahnawà:ke, Audra Simpson recognizes the trick of becoming visible in these settler contexts:

> The desires and attendant practices of settlers get rerouted, or displaced, in liberal argumentation through the trick of toleration, of "recognition" . . . an impossible and also tricky beneficence that actually may extend forms of settlement through the language and practices of, at times, nearly impossible but seemingly democratic inclusion (Wolfe 2011, 32). This inclusion, or juridical form of recognition, is only performed, however, if the problem of cultural difference and alterity does not pose too appalling a challenge to norms of the settler society (20)

In Hawai'i, the "trick of toleration, of 'recognition'" extends not only to formal forms such as federal recognition from the US Department of the Interior, but also to recognition within state institutions because that sort of recognition, particularly here in Hawai'i, leads to a flattening of sorts, with Hawaiians "recognized" as just another ethnic group in the stew, salad, hot pot, saimin, or whatever metaphor is chosen to represent Hawai'i's multiracial mix. Rather than validating the amorphous blob of the American melting pot, all such metaphors acknowledge the distinctiveness of individual ethnicities. But none of them acknowledge indigenous connections to 'āina. They ahistorically recognize the diversity of Hawai'i, generally connecting Local identity back to the Massie case and the shared struggle of the sugar plantations and later land disputes, but no further (Rosa 5–6; Fujikane 25–29). None of them even recognize the multi-ethnic makeup of the Hawaiian kingdom and that more than just Hawaiians lost their nation during the overthrow.

Though Local identity is an outgrowth of class solidarity and taking a collective stand against white supremacy, it developed after the overthrow of the kingdom and is generally invested in gaining power for Local people in the U.S. system. Its rootedness in pushing for agency in the settler state means that it is built upon a foundation of forgetting non-Hawaiian allegiance to the kingdom. Local identity is predicated on remembering and valorizing plantation solidarity, but not how the three main trials after the 1889 counter-revolt to overturn the Bayonet Constitution were of famed Hawaiian patriot Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox, but also for Albert Loomens, a Belgian soldier who joined the rebellion, and Ho Fon, a young Chinese newspaperman accused of acting as the liaison between the rebels and the Chinese merchants who supported them (Chapin *Shaping* 86). Immediately after the overthrow, Japanese laborers pledged their support to the queen, and provoked the Provisional Government by letting out three cheers for her whenever they passed ʻIolani Palace (Palmer 13). And the roster of the more than 300 people arrested for the 1895 counter-revolt includes such "foreign" names Lycurgus, Juen, Moon Kin, de Rega, Muller, Matsumoto, and more right next to Hakuole, Ahia, and Kekipi (Spencer 133–35).

It is undeniably more difficult to recognize Hawaiian historically as both a nationality, and therefore including individuals from different ethnic backgrounds, *and* as a marker of indigeneity, indicating not only cultural identity and practices, but also particular claims to land, including, but extending well beyond, lands seized from the kingdom. Understandings of Local identity and solidarity expressed through assimilative food metaphors obscure the rich history of solidarity across ethnic lines in the Hawaiian kingdom, and contribute to the elimination of the native *as native*. Recognizing this fact, and this history, is more liberatory for all involved, though it demands that we do the additional difficult work necessary to retain these nuances.

A Place in the Sun or a Place in the Courtroom

Tied to recognition through democratic inclusion within the settler state was a policy change in response to Kā‘eo's Hawaiian-language disappearing act that many viewed as a victory. Judge Kobayashi initially refused to grant Kā‘eo an interpreter because it was impractical and an unnecessary expense. There were precedents for the judge's refusal. In a 1993 federal case, the presiding judge found that if a person denied an interpreter could speak English, their due process rights were still protected (Hiraishi), and Debi Tulang-De Silva, Program Director for the State Judiciary's Office of Equality and Access to the Courts, initially said: "Basically there's no legal requirement to provide language interpreters to court participants who speak English" (Hiraishi). This opinion was however almost immediately overruled:

> The Judiciary today announced the following policy regarding Hawaiian language interpreters during courtroom proceedings:
>
> The Judiciary will provide or permit qualified Hawaiian language interpreters to the extent reasonably possible when parties in courtroom proceedings choose to express themselves through the Hawaiian language.
>
> The Judiciary will develop implementation procedures for this policy, and welcomes input from the community. ("Judiciary")

Many in the community had been calling for this very thing. Since Hawaiian had been an official state language since 1978, many Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians felt such a policy was fair, just, and equitable. "We pay taxes just like everybody else," said Tiare Lawrence, an aloha ‘āina who herself had been arrested over Haleakalā: "If a Hawaiian comes into a courtroom and wants an interpreter, then they should be allowed that service" (Nabarro "Rallies"). At a January hearing for an amended bill that would require interpreter services if any party to a court proceeding requests that it be conducted in Hawaiian, testimony was said to be "emotional and teary" at times, as supporters of the bill stressed the importance of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i (Wang).

Kanuha's and Kā'eo's canny refusals to translate laid the groundwork for greater access to Hawaiian-language interpretation services within the judicial system. This is undeniably an important victory for Hawaiian-language revitalization and renormalization efforts. We should be able to speak 'ōlelo Hawai'i wherever we go, and we should not wait until after achieving independence to make that happen. I wish, however, that I could believe the judiciary's quick policy change was motivated by a sincere understanding that 'ōlelo Hawai'i is the language of this land, and not simply a scramble to re-enfold Hawaiians within the settler colonial system. Refusing to translate makes legible Hawaiian difference and questions the authority of the State of Hawai'i. Having your day in court with a Hawaiian interpreter graciously provided by the state does not.

I am not denying the importance of 'ōlelo Hawai'i being everywhere, but rather, acknowledging the accuracy of Patrick Wolfe's observation that

> settler societies characteristically devise a number of often coexistent strategies to eliminate the threat posed by the survival in their midst of irregularly dispossessed social groups who were constituted prior to and independently of the normative basis on which settler society is established. These strategies include expulsion and other forms of geographical sequestration, *as well as programs of incorporation* that seek to efface the distinguishing criteria—biology, culture, mode of production, religion, etc.—whereby native difference is constructed in settler discourse. [emphasis added] (103)

Incorporating Hawaiian language into the judiciary's Office of Equality and Access to the Courts is just such an effacement of Hawaiian difference, whereby rather than speaking 'ōlelo Hawai'i as part of our liberation and decolonization/deoccupation, Hawaiians become recipients provided a service in the name of equality. Just another ethnic group.

As Tuck and Yang suggest, "this kind of inclusion is a form of enclosure, dangerous in how it domesticates decolonization" (3) because "the attainment of equal legal and cultural

entitlements . . . is actually an investment in settler colonialism" (18). This is a hard line to walk in an occupied nation though. How do we fight to exist as Hawaiians against a system dedicated to our erasure without entrenching ourselves even further through the promise, or even the granting, of more rights? Or as Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio puts it, "Do we conform our responses to the framework of the American political system, hoping that we might bring new benefits to our children thereby, or do we insist on clinging to every tradition that we can recover, insisting on our separateness, our distinctness, from a society that seemingly regards such distinction as anachronistic and dangerous? ("What" 373). Writing in 2001, he points to a difficult yet necessary answer: "Yet when we consider the first option, we realize that American law is no more reliable a friend to the Native Hawaiian at the dawn of this century than it was at the turn of the last" ("What" 373).

After the bench warrant was issued for Kāʻeo's arrest, Hawaiian academic and legal scholar Kekailoa Perry remarked that

> The judge knew Kalei, the prosecutor knew Kalei, everybody knows Kalei, but they put the blinders on and they said, "we're going to use the process to ignore you," to ignore not him, but all of us as Hawaiians. . . . It was a message that's being sent . . . to all of us: be careful because we have the power to suppress you, we have the power to shut you up. . . . And yet somehow we let ourselves get trapped into the thinking that somewhere along the line this government, this judge, this legal system going come out and protect us. Today is a message for all of us. There is no protection in the law. There is no protection in the US system. We're on our own. And you know what? Maikaʻi. Because when we're on our own together, there is nothing that can stop us. (Dukelow)

The thing is, we as Hawaiians know this. If any Hawaiian has paid attention to anything that has happened in the last century and a half or so, they will know that American law has never really been a friend to us. And yet. There are many Hawaiians who fight for federal recognition, many

who say that if it wasn't the U.S. who took us over it would have been Japan or Russia, so we should be grateful for our freedom.

That is not to say that we should abandon all recourse to the law, or shut down Ka Huli Ao Center For Excellence In Native Hawaiian Law, or minimize the importance of Hawaiian victories in the courts, or stop filing suits, or requesting injunctions, or fighting for more protections within the system. But as Tuck and Yang remind us, "decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation" (7). In Hawai'i certainly, everything is jumbled together, often making what is what hard to see. The only way for us to really find our way out from here is to remind ourselves continually how settler colonialism works, and especially, to be alert to what Tuck and Yang have termed "settler moves to innocence": "those strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege, without having to change much at all" (10). Greater availability of Hawaiian-language interpreters in court is indeed a victory, but it also represents a settler move to innocence. For a relatively small amount of money, the state has "helped" Hawaiians, contained the potentially disruptive power of refusing to translate, and kept Hawaiians safely ensconced in the idea of equality for all citizens.

Ka 'Ōlelo o ka 'Āina: "Sacred" Words

When speaking about their strategy of choosing to speak only in Hawaiian during their trials, both Kanuha and Kā'eo made connections between 'ōlelo Hawai'i and 'āina. Kanuha wanted "to highlight that the movement to revitalize the Hawaiian language is connected to the fight to protect Mauna Kea from desecration" (Associated Press). And according to Kā'eo, "There are things you can say in Hawaiian that you know really express through our cultural view of why it's important for us to defend our sacred sites" (Hiraishi). While not all who support the revitalization and renormalization of 'ōlelo Hawai'i have the same opinions about these

struggles over sacred sites, all would agree that our land and language are tied together and connected by ea. Ea is the word we use to talk about sovereignty; it is also our word for breath and for rising. We cannot speak our language without breath, without ea, and the more we speak, the more our ea grows. Kāʻeo explicitly connects ea and ʻāina:

> What's important here is the Hawaiian concept: ua mau ke ea o ka ʻāina. Ke ea o ka ʻāina, the life of the land, the sovereignty of the land is that very place. Hawaiians don't see that their sovereignty comes from a particular king. Our sovereignty does not come from a constitution. The sovereignty doesn't come from the gun. The sovereignty doesn't come from arms. But in fact the sovereignty comes from the land. So even according to our own cultural understandings, the land itself is our sovereignty (*Hawaiʻi: A Voice*)

Without these connections between ea and ʻāina, it unlikely that Kāʻeo or Kanuha would have refused to translate in the courtroom.

But without this struggle over our ʻāina and our breath, would the push for ʻōlelo have the same resonance? Would our souls reverberate the way they do when we hear our language spoken with skill and aloha? Rhetorical questions, perhaps. My sense is that the answer is no. Our ʻōlelo connects us to the place names of our land, the names of the wind and the rain. ʻĀina is the backbone of our traditional moʻolelo and our mele. And as Hawaiian scholar Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio explains, "this pilina to ʻāina is the standard by which we understand our pilina with each other. Our relationship to our ʻāina is our kumu, and every intimacy we practice thereafter echoes the intimacies learned from our beautiful home" (147–48). Everything that we learn in and about our language ties us more and more closely to ʻāina.

After the bench warrant was issued, Kāʻeo stood outside the courtroom and spoke about this connection between our ʻōlelo and our ʻāina. He reminded us that the Second Circuit Court was initially an institution of the Hawaiian kingdom, and how systemic change was what was necessary:

> Unfortunately, even having a translator still not good enough, but at least I would be able to speak in my language, you see. . . . I refuse. I refuse that anybody should tell a Hawaiian when they should speak Hawaiian. Especially in the defense of our sacred lands. This whole case is about being Hawaiian. (Maui Now "kaleikoa project 4")

Kanuha echoed these thoughts when he talked about the testimony that he gave in Hawaiian during his trial: "I was there to prevent desecration and it's a traditional and customary practice . . . .I recited my genealogy . . . showing that I do have a genealogical connection to these people and that place. My ancestors recognized and revered this place as someplace sacred" (Associated Press). Just as Kā'eo made clear in his testimony, Kanuha needed to speak about our relationship to 'āina in the language most suited to expressing it.

These are the things that resist easy translation. Both use the word "sacred" to describe the reverence they feel for 'āina; for both, the summits of Mauna Kea and Haleakalā are sacred, and the kia'i are trying to protect them from further desecration. But a problem arises when a single word, "sacred," is chosen to translate two completely different "original texts"—one drawn from a Hawaiian understanding and the other from a Western/American mainstream understanding. As readers and speakers we are familiar with the word "sacred," so we think we know what Kanuha and Kā'eo mean by "sacred" land. But does the word fully invoke for us the Hawaiian familial connection to 'āina, which means "that which feeds," and the reciprocal relationship of care between land as elder sibling and person as younger sibling, just for starters? In American society, willingness to die for family members is an admired and understood virtue. Yet when Kā'eo and other kia'i risk death to lay themselves in the path of semi-trucks carrying equipment up the mountain, they are labeled "crazy Hawaiians" (Loomis).

What is at issue is *not* that Hawaiian values and understandings of aloha 'āina are completely incommensurate and illegible to Western society, but that as Hawaiians we must live and speak in translation whenever we challenge the apparatuses of settler colonialism and all

those who wish to separate kānaka from ʻāina. “Living in translation” is not a metaphor. The concepts developed from living in connection with the ʻāina have come down from our ancestors rooted in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. That is where they gained their meaning, and where many of us have learned about and embraced them. But when we speak of such things to those who often have power over our bodies and our ʻāina, we must use English words to describe them, fitting for their benefit our understanding into little English-shaped slots. Acoma poet Simon Ortiz talks about the stakes of this kind of living:

> Using the English language is a dilemma and pretty scary sometimes, because it means letting one's mind go willfully—although with soul and heart and shaky hands, literally—into the Western cultural and intellectual context, a condition and circumstance that one usually avoids at all costs on most occasions. . . .years later I admit I felt uneasy and even disloyal moments when I found myself to be more verbally articulate in the English language than in my own native Acoma language. (xvi)

Because each language has its own values and history—the “cultural and intellectual context” Ortiz mentions—articulating Hawaiian things with an English tongue inevitably leads to misunderstandings. Our two most prominent land struggles hinge on the word “sacred,” and as Hawaiians, we know that we use that English word as a stand-in for kapu, aloha ʻāina, moʻokūʻauhau, pilina, kulāiwi, ʻohana, ʻai, ea—for so many of those concepts that make up our identity. But when many in the general public hear “sacred” they think “really really special”—someplace you would take a picture of for Instagram, someplace on your bucket list you want to visit, someplace super pretty, beautiful even—a place you have a good feeling about. For others, it could mean even less. People who don’t want to answer work emails on Saturday and Sunday might say “Sorry, my weekends are sacred.” And while many astronomers would agree that “sacred” means “really really special,” they also hear “really, really superstitious,” or even “we are the Catholic Church from 400 years ago coming to persecute you.” Kealoha Pisciotta, a

former telescope operator who is now one of the leaders of the fight against the TMT, had the perfect response: “We’re not the church. You’re not Galileo” (Overbye).

This narrowing of Hawaiians’ deep connection to ‘āina into a single English word with much less cultural weight—or weight and history in the wrong places, perhaps—has contributed greatly to reducing these struggles to the false dichotomies of science versus culture, or superstition versus progress. For Hawaiians, what Westerners distinguish as science and culture cannot be separated. We therefore had to invent a word for science, *not* because we could not comprehend the concept before Westerners arrived, but because our word ‘ike enfolded what Westerners call science within our connections to land, our ancestors, the seen and unseen around us—everything of the world.

As Tuck and Yang explain, at the heart of all these false dichotomies lies the biggest, most violent binary of them all: “Everything within a settler colonial society strains to destroy or assimilate the Native in order to disappear them from the land—this is how a society can have multiple simultaneous and conflicting messages about Indigenous peoples” (9). Because the opponents of the kia‘i quite literally wanted to “disappear them from the land” so they would stop blocking construction, the struggle was cast as between science and culture—and since Hawaiians were defending “culture,” they were therefore “anti-science”—even though many Hawaiian scientists were among the kia‘i. Yet in the same breath—not ea—the TMT proponents would point to decontextualized bits of our history, and triumphantly say, “Look, your ancestors were practicing science! Shouldn’t you support our scientific efforts if you care so much about your ancestors?”

As Samuel Kamakau once said, “Aole na ka malihini e ao ia‘u i ka mooolelo o ko‘u lahui, na‘u e ao aku i ka moolelo i ka malihini” (“Hooheihei”). Few things are less welcome than being offered paltry knowledge of our people and language to teach us about our own kūpuna. In this case, celestial navigation is the topic. Predictably, astronomers and TMT supporters were quick to point to our voyagers as scientists, apparently unaware that the Western scientific

establishment only accepted them as such a handful of decades ago, and that *Hōkūleʻa,* the reason they know anything about Hawaiian/Polynesian navigation at all, initially sailed because their own scientific ancestors did not consider such navigation to be a rigorously tested system of knowledge, choosing instead to believe that our kūpuna settled Polynesia by being blown off course while fishing—though apparently with a wide array of plants and livestock on board, as well as strategically chosen groups of people with various skill-sets that would enable entire civilizations to thrive.

Language and cultural revitalization are crucially important because when ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi and ʻike Hawaiʻi are more widespread within our communities, and the rest of Hawaiʻi as well, less living in translation will need to happen. Then, when we speak of Hawaiian things, or refer to traditional moʻolelo, or try to impress upon people the importance of ʻike kupuna, we will be standing on a shared foundation. But until that time, refusing to translate, refusing to live in translation, will be essential. It reminds people, kanaka and non-kanaka alike, that Hawaiians are different, with a different story in play than you are "getting" in English. It calls into question the authority of those we are refusing. And it communicates clearly that we are not interested in being another ethnic group within what is offered as equality. ʻO ke ea o ka ʻāina kā kākou e ʻimi nei, a ʻo ke ala i hiki aku ai i laila, ʻo ia nō ka ʻōlelo, ka nohona, a me ka ʻāina. Hōʻole nō kākou i ke ala a ʻoukou e kīpapa nei. A pehea, makemake ʻoe iaʻu e unuhi? Tsā, mai noho au a ʻae iki.

EPILOGUE: HE MAU HUA: WORDS FOR THE FUTURE

I have trouble taking on titles for myself sometimes. Though I have published both poetry and stories, I hesitate to call myself a poet or a fiction writer. But I since have been translating from ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi to English for almost two decades, I think it is accurate to say that I am a translator.

For many reasons, some appearing in the preceding chapters, I am however a rather ambivalent translator. I haven't participated in a large translation project for several years now because of that ambivalence, and I am not sure if I ever will again. Having explored in detail how translation out of Hawaiian and into English has created problems through translatorial intrusion, editorial obfuscation, and presentational delusion, at times I think that translating in that direction should be left by the wayside, never allowed to darken the doorways of our moʻolelo again.

This might seem to be the safest route to take. Learning ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi well enough to read our moʻolelo in their original language still speaks to a certain political and cultural commitment that is more likely to prevent cultural appropriation or misunderstanding. We will not agree on every issue—Mauna Kea, Hawaiian independence, demilitarization—but those willing to learn our language in this political and cultural climate are more than likely to side with those of us pushing for the ea and mana of the lāhui. There are no guarantees, of course. Even within the last decade, scholars and creative folks who have learned just enough ʻōlelo to enter the most basic levels of our moʻolelo and writings have immediately gone on to publish academic articles or make art out of what little they could glean.

Those of us who feel we have the kuleana to tell our moʻolelo—whether writers, translators, performers, filmmakers, or even those scholars and artists—always need to ask ourselves the question "Who is this for?" We must pay attention to who is gaining access to this ʻike, who stands to benefit from this moʻolelo being made available to the world. In the case of the extractive translations described in Chapter Four, for instance, Hawaiians were seldom if

ever the ones intended to reap these benefits. As postcolonial and translation theorist S. Shankar insists, such questions, such attention, require that "now, more than ever" we start building "a vigorous culture of translation—a widely disseminated and rich understanding of translation. Important as actual acts of translation are, it is also necessary to popularize a general understanding of translation that foregrounds interpretation rather than fidelity" (141). This one of the main contributions I am trying to make: to insure that we realize how important it is to pay attention to translation. We do not actually have to practice translation. But members of the general public, and as the ones most affected by these translations, the Hawaiian community especially, need to know how translation operates and has operated here, and need to be able to debate the effects of translation in useful and incisive ways. As academic treatises and online comments both confirm, if you are not a practicing translator or have not done formal translations, it is all too easy to take very dogmatic stances about translation, or to ignore its effects completely. Or both. That is why we, as readers/translators/speakers/non-speakers, must together build these understandings of translation.

A culture of translation would mean that we collectively understand the benefits and drawbacks of translation in specific contexts, and if we do translate, that we realize it is only one tool among many for telling and re-telling our moʻolelo. As it was for the nūpepa, the reason for translating must always be to increase our ea and mana. This does not mean the indiscriminate translation of everything in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi. It doesn't even necessarily mean countering the translation canon. It does however mean recognizing that we need our own foundation of moʻolelo, in whatever language serves our people best, in every genre and form possible—fiction, non-fiction, biography, sci-fi, fantasy, young adult, romance, poetry, movie, anime, documentary, whatever. Carried out and received with a fuller understanding of everything that comes with it, translation can contribute greatly to that effort.

Most translations are produced for audiences other than those the text was originally intended for. Films in English get translated into Cantonese, Portuguese novels into German. In

Hawai‘i, however, we most commonly translate these texts for ourselves, and in most indigenous contexts, where each translation is a politically charged and potentially activist act, the expectations and responsibilities for translators must be radically different. A powerful example of how translation can be part of a multi-pronged effort to serve a particular community is “He Mo‘olelo no ‘Umi: Kekahi Ali‘i Kaulana o Ko Hawai‘i Nei Pae ‘Āina” carried out by No‘eau Peralto in collaboration with the artist Haley Kailiehu and their organization Hui Mālama i ke Ala ‘Ūlili (HuiMAU). A non-profit based in the community of East Hāmākua, through ‘āina-centric projects and educational initiatives, HuiMAU focuses on community health in a broad sense. And while ‘Umi is a powerful story for the lāhui Hawai‘i, for the people of Hāmākua, no mo‘olelo could be more fitting.

Peralto followed a strategy reminiscent of how the mo‘olelo initially appeared in the nūpepa. His new translation arrived in serial installments on the HuiMAU website and in the *Hamakua Times,* Hāmākua’s community newspaper. He addresses his community readers in the intimate and familiar way nineteenth-century kākau mo‘olelo did, but he also adopts the Loeb Classical Library facing-page format discussed in Chapter Four, though for very different reasons. In 1932, Martha Beckwith challenged readers to check her facing-page translations of Kepelino’s account of Hawaiian history against the original: “If anyone familiar with the Hawaiian language can propose a better reading for any passage, the text is here to test his judgment” (3). Peralto’s motivation for providing the original is to show respect for and accountability to the mo‘olelo, and to give readers easy access to an important ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i text. He therefore makes the mo‘olelo available to the widest and most diverse audience possible, encompassing those who would prefer to read the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, those preferring the English, and those with reasons for wanting both. Hawaiian-language speakers can read the original text, but the translation is right there to help with any problems in understanding. As for English-only readers, the constant presence of the Hawaiian text, and Peralto’s editorial discussion, remind them that they are reading a translation and there are limitations to what she is reading.

What makes this translation even more powerful is that it is part of a suite of moʻolelo that come in different genres that engender even more community interaction. Besides being available in the newspaper and online, the moʻolelo of ʻUmi has been presented informally at public workdays on ʻāina associated with ʻUmi, and more formally, through a community mural project at Paʻauilo Elementary and Intermediate School headed by Haley Kailiehu ("ʻUmi-a-Līloa"), and through a hula drama featuring keiki aged 5-14 as part of HuiMAU's HoAMa afterschool mentorship program ("Ka Moʻolelo o ʻUmi").

This wide-ranging and deeply rooted project shows us a radically different way of approaching translation. The starting point in the process is no longer the text, but the community and its needs. With regard to translation and social interactivity, André Lefevere states:

> Potential translators therefore need to learn to proceed from the top down, that is, from the culture to the text to the structure of that text to paragraphs, lines, phrases and words or, if you prefer, from the macro to the micro level. On the micro level translators can use all the linguistic and hermeneutic techniques that they learned, but the finality of their endeavor is the text as part of the culture, not the much vaunted struggle with the word, the sentence, or the line. (13)

If I consider carrying out a translation and do not start at the macro level—of community, of ʻāina, of lāhui—but act only for academic reasons—what for instance will get me the most attention as a scholar—I will have already failed. "To say that translation is resistant, engaged, or activist does not suffice to conclude that it is ethical or responsible," Maria Tymoczko writes; only the community can tell me that ("Space" 251).

The moʻolelo suite containing Peralto's translation and HuiMAU's dedication to the community of Hāmākua reminds those of us who choose to act as translators that we cannot afford to view ourselves as somehow outside of the fray, in the neutral third space between languages, between communities, and that therefore we are not responsible for that life and

death. We need to embed ourselves in our Hawaiian language and Hawaiian community, making our allegiances clear to all involved, planting ourselves in the community, being nourished by the community, but also and always feeding the community.

To return to the question "Who is this for?" we can therefore answer by slightly tweaking Paulo Freire's classic formulation. If as members of the lāhui and the Hawai'i community we decide translation is a necessary route for a mo'olelo, we must translate not *about* our people, and not only *for* our people, but *with* our people. As they were for the nūpepa, Hawaiians need to be the primary audience and interlocutors, even if that means addressing a single community, as Peralto has. But Hawaiians also need to be the translators, just as they were in the nūpepa, and the editors, and the publishers and so on. This challenge can be met by focusing more closely on the material practice of translation, and by ensuring that translators do not believe that their work is transparent—that they have no ideological effect on the text. As Hawaiian scholar Heoli Osorio observes, "translation often recreates and reinforces such structures as patriarchy, heterosexism, and white supremacy," but "in turn our mo'olelo can assist us in deconstructing these imposed forces" (80). A more widespread culture of translation would allow the structures too often sustained by translations to be questioned, and would strengthen our abilities as translators to deconstruct those structures.

The forces out of which the canonical translations grew (colonialism, language loss, English-only education, heteropatriarchy, population decline) also have made it necessary for Hawaiians to turn to these captured translations to re-learn about our own history and mo'olelo. Though many more of us are using the nūpepa, handwritten manuscripts, and other archival materials ma ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i nowadays, the effects of our long reliance on the extractive translation canon still echo throughout how we speak about ourselves today. Try searching any local news site for how many times "ancient" comes up before the word "Hawaiian." Everything from hula to fishponds is routinely designated "ancient," even though hula has never stopped being practiced, and some of the "ancient" fishponds remained in operation throughout the

twentieth century. As for our moʻolelo, if you actually look at them, you will discover a powerful tradition of innovation. But because all good things Hawaiian are described as part of antiquity, so much of what we think we know has been powerfully shaped by the canon of translated texts designed to portray us as of the past. How differently would we see ourselves if the texts translated from Hawaiian had included *Kaua Kuloko 1895: Ka Hoao ana e Hookahuli i ke Aupuni i Lokahi ole ia, ka Repubalika o Hawaii* [ʻ1895 Civil War: The Attempt to Overthrow the Undesirable Government, the Republic of Hawaiʻi], edited by Tamaki Spencer? Or Kahikina Kelekonaʼs literary experiments, which combine his acute knowledge of Hawaiian moʻolelo and his masterful use of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi with the dark influences of Edgar Allen Poe?

As the critical mass of folks whose ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi is advanced enough to read such texts expands, the texts in turn becoming more accessible, entering the public discourse as reminders of the evolving mana and ea of our lāhui. And yet, while the latest numbers from Ka Haka ʻUla o Keʻelikōlani, the Hawaiian Language College at UH-Hilo, indicate that we now have over 26,000 speakers, that is still less than 2% of the population (Ka Haka). So while the growing number of speakers suggests there might be an expiration date for needing a lot of translation from Hawaiian, a culture to question and understand translation still needs to be created and sustained to inform how we look at our history.

I believe that translators are uniquely qualified to influence and speak back to the operations of dominant narratives—to those texts in the translation canon certainly, but also those that continue to oppress people here in Hawaiʻi, and throughout the world. Learning about translation in the kingdom era could grant us some of the ʻike necessary to transform translation, as Tejaswini Niranjana has suggested, “from being a ʻcontainingʼ force . . . into a disruptive, disseminating one” (186)—a force that can challenge the stories told about us for too long, and a force that can aid us in regaining and sharing our own moʻolelo.

By now, this dissertation should have made clear that translation is immensely powerful, with effects that can be devastating or uplifting. Our moʻolelo have the mana to give us the

strength necessary for creating a foundation from which we can grow. But when translated without care for our kānaka, our kaiaulu, or our lāhui, those same moʻolelo can wound us for generations. Kānaka are re-finding our voices and speaking out, and we are exerting the power of our language and culture in arenas that would have been unthinkable a decade or two ago. But that is why we must be wary and ensure that we develop a culture of translation. Translation has something to offer us as a liberatory praxis, and I think that there is mana down that path. But just as importantly, translation has so powerfully influenced our history and culture, and shaped our very understandings of that history and culture, that we *must* pay attention to how translation operates so we are aware of the effects it has had and continues to have to this very day—whether another word of our ʻōlelo is ever translated, or not.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"6 arrested in protests over construction of telescope atop Haleakala." *Hawaii News Now,* 2 Aug 2017, http://www.hawaiinewsnow.com/story/36022915/officials-gear-up-for-potential-protests-ahead-of-telescope-construction-atop-haleakala.

Adams, James Eli. *A History of Victorian Literature.* Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Adamski, Mary. "New Hawaiian Bible is online." *Honolulu Star Bulletin,* 14 Oct 2006, http://archives.starbulletin.com/2006/10/14/features/adamski.html.

"Adamu." *Ke Au Okoa.* 12 Jun 1865, p. 4.

"Advertise." *The Polynesian.* 19 July 1862, p. 1.

Aiu, Pua'alaokalani D. "Ne'e Papa i ke Ō Mau: Language as an Indicator of Hawaiian Resistance and Power." *Translation, Resistance, Activism,* edited by Maria Tymoczko, U of Massachusetts P, 2010, pp. 89–107.

"Ke Akamai o na Elepani." *Ke Kumu Hawaii,* 10 Dec 1834, p. 19.

Akeoiaio. "Ka Baibala ka Lunakanawai Kiekie." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 23 Nov 1867, p. 4.

Alekanedero. "Ka Make ana o Rev. S. Dibela." *Ka Nonanona,* 4 Mar 1845, pp. 104–106.

Alexander, W. D. *History of Later Years of the Hawaiian Monarchy and the Revolution of 1893.* Hawaiian Gazette Co., 1896.

---. *Kalakaua's Reign: A Sketch of Hawaiian History.* Hawaiian Gazette Company Publishers, 1894.

---. "The Uncompleted Treaty of Annexation of 1854." *Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, vol. 9, 1897, pp. 1–67.

Allen, Chadwick. *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies.* U of Minnesota P, 2012.

The Alphabet. Mission Press, 1822.

American Bible Society. *Annual Reports of the American Bible Society.* Daniel Fanshaw, 1838.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1816.* T. R. Marvin, 1817.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1817.* T. R. Marvin, 1818.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1818.* T. R. Marvin, 1819.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1820.* T. R. Marvin, 1821.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1821.* T. R. Marvin, 1822.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1822.* T. R. Marvin, 1823.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1823.* T. R. Marvin, 1824.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1824.* T. R. Marvin, 1825.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1825.* T. R. Marvin, 1826.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1826.* T. R. Marvin, 1827.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1827.* T. R. Marvin, 1828.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Annual Report for 1829.* T. R. Marvin, 1830.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Extracts from the Minutes of the General Meeting of the Sandwich Islands Mission, 1823.* Mission Press, 1823.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Extracts from the Minutes of the General Meeting of the Sandwich Islands Mission, 1830.* Mission Press, 1830.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Extracts from the Minutes of the General Meeting of the Sandwich Islands Mission, 1831.* Mission Press, 1831.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Extracts from the Minutes of the General Meeting of the Sandwich Islands Mission, 1833.* Mission Press, 1833.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Extracts from the Minutes of the General Meeting of the Sandwich Islands Mission, 1834.* Mission Press, 1834.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *Instructions from the Prudential Committee of the ABCFM to Members of the Mission to the Sandwich Islands.* Samuel T. Armstrong, 1819.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. *A Narrative of Five Youth from the Sandwich Islands.* J. Seymour, 1816.

Andrews, Lorrin. "Essay on the Best Practicable Method of Conducting Native Schools at the Sandwich Islands." *Annual Report of the ABCFM Read at the 25th Annual Meeting*, 1834, pp. 156–68.

---. "Remarks on the Hawaiian Dialect of the Polynesian Language; prepared for the Repository." *The Chinese Repository,* vol. 5, 1837, pp. 12–21.

"Ka Anesona Moolelo no Hawaii Nei." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* 19 Jan 1865, p. 1.

Arista, Noelani. "Navigating Uncharted Oceans of Meaning: *Kaona* as Historical and Interpretive Method." *PMLA*, vol. 125, no. 3, 2010, pp. 663-669.

Armstrong, Richard. "Journal of Mr. Armstrong on the Island of Maui." *The Missionary Herald,* July 1838, p. 244.

Asensio, Rubén Fernández. "Language Policy in the Kingdom of Hawai'i: A Wordly English Approach." *Second Language Studies,* vol. 28, no. 2, 2010, pp. 1–48.

Ashton, Rosemary. “From the SDUK to the Passmore Edwards Settlement: Widening Access to Education in Bloomsbury.” *Bloomsbury Project,* Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, 26 Jun 2008, Unpublished Conference Paper, University College of London, Bloomsbury, 2018.

Associated Press. “Telescope Protestor Found Not Guilty after Trial in Hawaiian.” *Honolulu Star-Advertiser*, 8 Jan 2016, http://www.staradvertiser.com/2016/01/08/breaking-news/telescope-protester-found-not-guilty-after-trial-in-hawaiian/.

Bacchilega, Cristina. *Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2007.

Bacchilega, Cristina and Noelani Arista. “The *Arabian Nights* in the *Kuokoa,* a Nineteenth-Century Hawaiian Newspaper: Reflections on the Politics of Translation.” *The Arabian Nights in Transnational Perspective,* Edited by Ulrich Marzolph, Wayne State U P, 2007, pp. 157–182.

“Ka Baibala Hawaii.” *Ka Hoku Loa.* July 1861, p. 1.

Baker, Mona. “Translation and Activism: Emerging Patterns of Narrative Community.” *Translation, Resistance, Activism,* Edited by Maria Tymoczko, U of Massachusetts P, 2010, pp. 23–41.

Ballou, Howard M. And George R. Carter. “The History of the Hawaiian Mission Press, with a Bibliography of the Earlier Publications.” *Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, vol. 14, 1908, pp. 9–44.

Barker, Joanne. “Indigenous Feminisms.” *Oxford Handbook of Indigenous People’s Politics*, Oxford U P, 2015.

Beamer, Kamanamaikalani. *No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation.* Kamehameha Publishing, 2014.

Beckwith, Martha. Introduction. *Kepelino’s Traditionas of Hawaii*. Bishop Museum P, 1932.

Benedetto, Robert. *The Hawaii Journals of the New England Missionaries 1813–1894: A Guide to the Holdings of the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society Library*. Hawaiian Mission Children's Society, 1982.

Bermann, Sandra. Introduction. *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation.* Edited by Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, Princeton U P, 2005, pp. 1–10.

Beyer, Carl Kalani. *Manual and Industrial Education During Hawaiian Sovereignty: Curriculum in the Transculturation of Hawai'i.* 2004, U of Illinois-Chicago, PhD Dissertation.

Binamu. "Ka Unuhi ana i ka Baibala." *Ke Kumu Hawaii*. 10 Apr, 1839, p. 91.

Binamu, H. "Helu 1. He Olelo Hoomoakaka i ka Paulo Palapala i ko Roma." *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, 12 Nov 1834, pp. 2–3.

Bingham, Hiram. *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands.* Sherman Converse, 1848.

Bishop, Artemas. "Address: A Brief History of the Holy Scriptures into the Hawaiian Language." *The Friend*, 1 Aug 1844, pp. 74–75.

Bishop Museum. *Occasional Papers of Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Volume 6.* Bishop Museum Press, 1914–1918.

Board of Education, Kingdom of Hawai'i. *Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education.* By Charles Reed Bishop, 1880.

Board of Education, Republic of Hawai'i. *Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education.* By William DeWitt Alexander, 1895.

Bowser, George. *The Hawaiian Kingdom Statistical and Commercial Directory and Tourists' Guide, 1880–1881*. George Bowser & Co., 1880.

Brake, Laurel and Marysa Demoor. *DNCJ: Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland.* Academia Press, 2009.

Brown, Marie Alohalani. *Facing the Spears of Change: The Life and Legacy of John Papa 'Ī'ī.* U of Hawai'i P, 2016.

Brumaghim, Wayne H. *The Life and Legacy of Heneri ʻŌpūkahaʻia: Hawaiʻi's Prodigal Son.* 2011, U of Hawaiʻi, MA Thesis.

"Ka Buke o na Olelo Hooholo o ka Aha Kiekie." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 2 Nov 1867, p. 2.

"Na Buke Hou." *Ka Nonanona*, 23 Mar 1843, p. 104.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vol I.* Translated by John Allen, Hezekiah Howe, 1816.

Campbell, Scott. Comment on "Rep. Hanohano Prevails in Language Flap." *KITV4 Island News,* 6 March 2014, http://www.kitv.com/news/hawaii/rep-hanohano-prevails-in-language-flap/24839996#comments.

Casanova, Pascale. "Consecration and Accumulation of Literary Capital: Translation as Unequal Exchange." *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, Edited by Mona Baker, Routledge, 2010, pp. 285–303.

Cataluna, Lee. "Kauaʻi Tale told by Puppets." *Honolulu Advertiser*, 5 Mar 2010, http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2010/Mar/05/ln/hawaii3050336.html.

Chamberlain, Levi. Journal Volume 0006 and Insert 1826.06.21–1826.11.27. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/36.

---. Journal Volume 0023 and Inserts 1838.10.01–1842.07.21. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/53.

Chang, David A. "The Good Written Word of Life: The Native Hawaiian Appropriation of Textuality." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 75, no. 2, 2018, pp. 237–258.

Chapin, Helen. *Guide to Newspapers of Hawaiʻi: 1834–2000.* Hawaiian Historical Society, 2003.

---. *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawaiʻi*. U of Hawaiʻi P, 1996.

Chaplin, George. *Presstime in Paradise: The Life and Times of the Honolulu Advertiser, 1856–1995.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1998.

Charlot, John. *Classical Hawaiian Education: Generations of Hawaiian Culture.* The Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University-Hawaiʻi, 2005.

Cheyfitz, Eric. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan, Expanded Edition*. U of Pennsylvania P, 1997.

Constitution and by-laws of the Hale Naua or Temple of Science: Ancient Secret Society of the Order of Nauas, or Order of the Temple of Science. Hale Naua, 1890.

Cook, James. *The Three Voyages of Captain Cook Round the World.* J. Limbird, 1824.

Cooke, Amos Starr. Journal 1836–1838. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/65.

Cooke, Amos Starr. Journal 1839–1840. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/66.

Cooke, Amos Starr. Journal 1840–1842. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/67.

Cooke, Amos Starr. Journal 1842–1846. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/68.

Cooke, Amos Starr. Journal 1846–1850. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/69.

Correspondence Between the Government of the Republic of Hawaii and Her Britannic Majesty's Government in Relation to the Claims of Certain British Subjects Arrested for Complicity in the Insurrection of 1895 in the Hawaiian Islands. Hawaiian Gazette Company, 1899.

Creutz, Edward C. "The Role of the Bishop Museum in the Pacific." *Captain Cook and the Pacific Island.* Edited by Jane N. Hurd and Michiko Kodama, Pacific Island Studies Program, U of Hawai'i, 1978, pp. 13–23.

Day, A. Grove. *Books About Hawaii: Fifty Basic Authors.* U P of Hawaii, 1977.

Day, A. Grove, and Albertine Loomis. *Ka Pa'i Palapala: Early Printing in Hawaii.* Printing Industries of Hawaii, 1973.

Dayton, Kevin. “Chin Leads State Planning to Address TMT Protests.” *Honolulu Star-Advertiser*, 31 Oct 2018, http://www.staradvertiser.com/2018/10/31/hawaii-news/ chin-leads-state-planning-to-address-any-protests/.

Deloria, Philip J. *Indians in Unexpected Places.* U P of Kansas, 2004.

Department of Public Instruction, Kingdom of Hawai‘i. *Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education*, by W. D. Alexander, Honolulu, 1895.

Desha, Stephen L. *Kamehameha and his Warrior Kekūhaupi‘o.* Translated by Frances Frazier, Kamehameha Press, 2000.

Dibble, Sheldon. *History and General Views of the Sandwich Islands’ Mission.* Taylor & Dodd, 1839.

Dizon, Kaci-Cheree Puaokamele. Video: “Kaleikoa Kaeo - DOI Testimony: “The Kanaka Stain is Strong.” *Facebook*, 1 Oct 2016, https://www.facebook.com/Kaci.Cheree/videos/1306117992754929/.

“Dorothy Barrére, 96.” *Montana Standard.* 10 Nov 2009, https://mtstandard.com/news/local/obituaries/dorothy-barr-re/article_9bfbe1fb-e63b-5fcf-8f4f-5e5e844790f8.html.

Dukelow, Kahele. Video: “THE JUDGE REFUSED TO RECOGNIZE KALEIKOA UNLESS HE SPOKE ENGLISH. RACISM IS ALIVE AND WELL IN HAWAI‘I. Post trial analysis.” *Facebook,* 24 Jan 2018, 2:54pm, https://www.facebook.com/kahele.dukelow/videos/10213894130645645/.

Dunn, Barbara. “William Little Lee and Catherine Lee, Letters from Hawai‘i 1848–1855.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 38, 2004, pp. 59–88.

Dwight, E. W. *Memoirs of Henry Obookiah, a Native of Owhyhee, and a Member of the Foreign Mission School.* J & E Sanderson, 1819.

“E Ae Anei Kakou e Make ka Olelo Hawaii?” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* 6 Jan 1922, p. 3.

“Ecclesiastical Thunder.” *The Polynesian*, 1 Nov 1862, p. 2.

“Educational.” *The Polynesian*, 13 Dec 1862, p. 2.

"He Eehia, he Welina Aloha no G W Kanuha." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* 24 Jun 1876, p. 2.

Elbert, Samuel H. "The Hawaiian Dictionaries, Past and Future." *Sixty-Second Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, 1953, pp. 5–18.

Ellis, William. *The American Mission in the Sandwich Islands: A Vindication and an Appeal.* Jackson, Walford, and Hodder, 1866.

Emory, Kenneth. Introduction. *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, By John Papa ʻĪʻī, Translated by Mary Kawena Pukui, Bishop Museum Press, 1959.

Enemi, Egemona. "Oiaio Ole." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 1 Jul 1876, p. 2.

Fermoso, Jose. "Why Speaking Spanish is Becoming Dangerous in America." *The Guardian*, 22 May 2018, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/may/22/speaking-spanish-dangerous-america-aaron-schlossberg-ice.

"F. J. Testa, (Hoke)." *Ka Makaainana*, 15 Apr 1895, p. 3.

Forbes, David. *Hawaiian National Bibliography, 1780-1900: Vol. 1 1780–1830.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1998.

---. *Hawaiian National Bibliography, 1780-1900: Vol. 2 1831–1850.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1998.

---. *Hawaiian National Bibliography, 1780-1900: Vol. 3 1851–1880.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1998.

---. *Hawaiian National Bibliography, 1780-1900: Vol. 4 1881–1900.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1998.

Fornander, Abraham. *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-Lore. Vol 4.* Bishop Museum, 1916–1917.

---. *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-Lore. Vol 5.* Bishop Museum, 1998.

Frazier, Frances N. "'Battle of Kalalau' as reported in the newspaper *Kuokoa*." *Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 23, 1989, pp. 108–118.

---. *Haliʻa of Hawaiʻi: A Legacy of Language.* AuthorHouse, 2010.

---. Interview. *Ka Moolelo Oiaio o Kaluaikoolau: The True Story of Kaluaikoolau.* Directed by E. Koohan Paik, Ke Kula Niʻihau o Kekaha Learning Center and Kumulipo Productions, 2006.

---. Introduction. *The True Story of Kaluaikoolau.* Translated by Frances Frazier, U of Hawai‘i P, 2001.

Frear, Walter F.“The Evolution of the Hawaiian Judiciary.” *Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, vol. 7, 1894, pp. 1–25.

---. “Hawaiian Statute Law.” *Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1906, pp. 15–61.

Fujikane, Candace. “Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai‘i.” *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i*, Edited by Jonathan Y. Okamura and Candace Fujikane, U of Hawai‘i P, 2008, pp. 1–42.

Fujimoto, Lila. “Charges Dismissed against Telescope Protestor.” *The Maui News.* 12 July 2018, http://www.mauinews.com/news/local-news/2018/07/charges-dismissed-against-telescope-protester/.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. U of California P, 2007.

Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Noelani. “Reproducing the Ropes of Resistance: Hawaiian Studies Methodologies.” *Kanaka ‘Ōiwi Methodologies: Mo‘olelo and Metaphor*, Edited by Katrina-Ann R. Kapā‘anaokalāokeola Nākoa Oliveira, and Erin Kahunawaika‘ala Wright, U of Hawai‘i P, 2015, pp. 1–29.

Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Noelani and Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada. “Making ‘Aha: Independent Hawaiian Pasts, Presents & Futures.” *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol. 147, no. 2, 2018, pp. 49–59.

“Ke Gorila o Hawaii Nei.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 22 Feb 1862, p. 2.

Gregory, Herbert E. *Report of the Director for 1922.* Bishop Museum, 1923.

Gulick, Peter Johnson. Autobiography 1797–1877. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/78.

Gutierrez, Ben. “At least 20 arrested in attempt to block work on Daniel K. Inouye Solar Telescope on Maui.” *Hawaii News Now*, 31 July 2015, http://www.hawaiinewsnow.com/story/29677494/protestors-block-work-on-daniel-k-inouye-telescope-on-haleakala.

Gutmanis, June. “The Law...Shall Punish All Men Who Commit Crime...” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 8, 1974, pp. 143–145.

Haase, Donald. “Framing the Brothers Grimm: paratexts and intercultural transmission in postwar English-language editions of the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen.*” *Fabula*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2003, pp. 55–69.

“Haehae ka Manu, Ke Ale nei i ka Wai.” *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, July 3, 1894, p. 2.

Ka Haka ʻUla o Keʻelikōlani, University of Hawaiʻi-Hilo. “Through, Of and About Hawaiian.” Infographic, 2018.

“Ka Halawai ana o ka Ahaolelo Elele!” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 9 July 1864, p. 2.

“Halawai ma Kaumakapili.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 12 Apr 1862, p. 1.

Hale Naua Society, 1886-1891: Translation of Documents at the Hawaiʻi State Archives and Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society Library. Hawaiian Mission Society, 1999.

Haleole, S. N. “Na Manao o S. N. Haleole.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 1 Jun 1865, p. 3.

---. “He Mau Wahi Olelo Mua no ke Kaao o Asimeda.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 1 Jun 1865, p. 2.

Handy, E. S. Craighill, and Mary Kawena Pukui. *The Polynesian Family System in Kaʻū.* 1950, Mutual Publishing, 1999.

Hawaiʻi: A Voice for Sovereignty. Directed by Catherine Bauknight, Mark Alexander, and Aleck Cheney, Othila Media, 2009.

Hawaii Department of Public Instruction. *Report of the Minister of Public Instruction to the President of the Republic of Hawaii for the Biennial Period Ending December 31st, 1899.* By Henry Schuler Townsend, Hawaiian Gazette Company, 1900.

Hawaii Judiciary Department. *Biennial Report of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for the Years 1892 and 1893*, Robert Grieve, 1894.

Hawaiian Hansard: A Complete Verbatim Report of the Proceedings and Speeches of the Hawaiian Legislative Assembly of 1886. Daily Bulletin Steam Printing Office, 1886.

Hawaiian Mission Children's Society. *Missionary Album: Portraits and Biographical Sketches of the American Protestant Missionaries to the Hawaiian Islands.* Hawaiian Mission Children's Society, 1969.

Hengel, Martin. *Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. T & T Clark International, 2004.

Hiraishi, Ku'uwehi. "Maui Telescope Protestor Battles over Hawaiian Language Use in Court." *Hawai'i Public Radio*, 24 Jan 2018, http://www.hawaiipublicradio.org/post/maui-telescope-protestor-battles-over-hawaiian-language-use-court.

"History." *Mauna Kea Astronomy Outreach Committee.* http://www.mkaoc.org/history.

"History of the Cherokee Phoenix." *The Cherokee Phoenix.* 13 Jan 2015, http://www.cherokeephoenix.org/Article/index/9955.

Hoapili, Robert. "He Moolelo no Tamakai Ionakana Iakekona." *Ka Lahui Hawaii*, 30 Jul 1876, p. 4.

"Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika." *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 26 Sep 1861, p. 4.

Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika, 3 Oct 1861, p. 2.

Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika, 10 Oct 1861, p. 2.

Holman, Janet Susan. Comment on "Rep. Hanohano Prevails in Language Flap." *KITV4 Island News,* 6 March 2014, http://www.kitv.com/news/hawaii/rep-hanohano-prevails-in-language-flap/24839996#comments.

"Holo ana Mai Maui i Oahu." *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, 22 Nov 1837, p. 49.

"Home." *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 30 Dec 1857, p. 158.

"Hooholoia ke Kuikahi Panailike!" *Ka Lahui Hawaii*, 15 Apr 1875, p. 2.

"Hookakahele ke Keiki Hawaii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 4 Aug 1866, p. 2.

"Ka Hookolokolo ana o Keone Lu." *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, 28 Oct 1835, p. 173.

ho‘omanawanui, ku‘ualoha. *Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi‘iaka.* U of Minnesota P, 2014.

“Hoopaapaa Nupepa.” *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 16 May, 1860, p. 2.

Ho‘oulumāhiehie. *Ka Mo‘olelo o Hi‘iakaikapoliopele.* Translated by Puakea Nogelmeier, Sahoa Fukushima, and Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada. Awaiāulu Press, 2007.

---.“Ka Moolelo o Kamehameha I.” *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, 27 Nov 1905-16 Nov 1906.

Hori, Joan. “Background and Historical Significance of Ka Nupepa Kuokoa.” 2001, http://libweb.hawaii.edu/digicoll/nupepa_kuokoa/kuokoa_htm/kuokoa.html.

Horsley, G. H. R. “One Hundred Years of the Loeb Classical Library.” *Buried History*, vol. 47, 2011, pp. 35–58.

Hunt, Sarah (Kwakwaka’wakw). *“Law, Colonialism and Space” in Witnessing the Colonialscape: Lighting the Intimate Fires of Indigenous Legal Pluralism*. 2013, Simon Fraser University, PhD Dissertation.

‘Ī‘ī, John Papa. “Hunahuna Moolelo Hawaii.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 14 Aug 1869, pp. 1.

Inefuku, Terri. “Protesters arrested for allegedly blocking access to Mauna Kea summit.” *KHON2 News.* 2 April 2015, https://www.khon2.com/news/local-news/protesters-arrested- for-allegedly-blocking-access-to-mauna-kea-summit_20180309113623175/1025595582.

Ing, Tiffany. *Ka Ho‘omālamalama ‘ana o nā Hō‘ailona o ka Mō‘ī Kalākaua a me Kona Noho Ali‘i ‘ana: Illuminating the American, International, and Hawai‘i Representations of David Kalākaua and His Reign, 1874-1891.* 2015, U of Hawai‘i, PhD Dissertation.

“Instructions of the Prudential Committee to the Missionaries about to Embark for the Sandwich Islands.” *The Missionary Herald, For the Year 1823, Vol 19*, pp. 106–110.

Iwa, Joseph. P. “Heaha la ke kumu o ka Hookapeke ana o Kekahi Poe ma ka Olelo Hawaii?” *Ka Lahui Hawaii*, 3 Feb 1876, p. 1.

“John M. Kaneakua.” *Ka Makaainana*, 17 Dec 1887, p. 1.

Johnson, Rubellite Kinney. *Kukini ʻAhaʻilono: Over a Century of Native Hawaiian Life and Thought from the Hawaiian Languages Newspapers of 1834 to 1948.* Topgallant Publishing Co., Ltd., 1976.

"Journal of the Sandwich Island Mission. 1819-1825." *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/86.

Judd, Albert Francis "Translation of the Address of Hon. A. F. Judd on the Jubilee of the Hawaiian Bible." *Annual Report of the Hawaiian Evangelical Society*, vol. 27, 1889, pp. 52–59.

Judd, Bernice, Janet E. Bell, and Clare G. Murdock, eds. *Hawaiian Language Imprints, 1822-1899.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1978.

Judd, Laura Fish. *Honolulu: Sketches of Life, Social, Political, and Religious in the Hawaiian Islands from 1828 to 1861.* 1861, Anson D. F. Randolph and Company, 1880.

"Judge Blaine J. Kobayashi." *Hawaii State Judiciary*, n.d., http://www.courts.state.hi.us/courts/district/judges/judge_blaine_kobayashi.

"Judge: Thirty Meter Telescope should be given OK to move forward." *Hawaii News Now,* 27 July 2018, http://www.hawaiinewsnow.com/story/35981511/judge-in-tmt-contested-case-hearing-recommends-project-move-forward.

"Judiciary Announces Hawaiian Language Interpreter Policy." *Hawaii State Judiciary,* 26 Jan 2018, http://www.courts.state.hi.us/news_and_reports/press_releases/2018/01/judiciary-announces-hawaiian-language-interpreter-policy.

jusanopinion101. Comment on "Rep. Hanohano Prevails in Language Flap." *KITV4 Island News,* 6 March 2014, http://www.kitv.com/news/hawaii/rep-hanohano-prevails-in-language-flap/24839996#comments.

"J.W. Keawehunahala, W.H. Davis & Co." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 21 Sep 1872, p. 3.

"He Kaao Hou no na Mea Kupanaha o ka Moana." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 18 Sep 1875, p. 2.

Kā‘eo, Kaleikoa. “Speech: Kaleikoa Ka‘eo on the TMT.” *Hawaii Independent,* 24 Apr 2015, http://hawaiiindependent.net/story/speech-kaleikoa-kaeo-on-the-tmt.

Kahaekirikiano, J. W. P. “Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika. Aloha Oe.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 3 Oct 1861, p. 2.

“Kahaha.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 9 Nov 1867, p. 3.

Kahelemauna, Mary K. “Hoopololei.” *Ka Lahui Hawaii*, 22 Feb 1877, p. 3.

“Kalaihi ka Lani.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 26 Sep 1861, p. 2.

Kalaikini, Samuel Kaiai. “Pane ia Geo. B. Wahinealoha.” *Ka Lahui Hawaii*, 4 Jan 1877, p. 1.

Kalama. “Lahainaluna, Mar. 15, 1838.” *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, 18 July 1838, p. 13.

Kalapukaihaehae. “He Wahi Manao Mahalo ia Pilipo o Kona Akau Hawaii.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 7 Nov 1861, p. 4.

Kam, Ralph Thomas. “Language and Loyalty: Americanism and the Regulation of Foreign Language Schools in Hawai‘i.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 40, 2006, pp. 131–147.

Kamakau, Samuel M. *Ke Aupuni Mō‘ī.* Kamehameha Schools Press, 2001.

---. “Hooheihei ka Nukahalale, ka Nukahalale.” *Ke Au Okoa*, 16 Oct 1865, p. 1.

---. *Ke Kumu Aupuni.* ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, 1996.

---. *Ka Po‘e Kahiko: The People of Old.* 1964, Bishop Museum P, 1992.

---. *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai‘i.* 1961, Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992.

---. *Works of the People of Old: Na Hana a ka Poe Kahiko.* Bishop Museum P, 1976.

“Ke Kanawai, Helu 27.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 1 Mar 1879, p. 2.

Kānepu‘u, J. H. “Ahe! He Nupepa Hou Ka!!” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina,* 2 Feb 1878, p. 1.

---. “Mea Minamina i Pau Ole i ka Hoolahaia mai e A. Bihopa.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 21 Nov 1861, p. 4.

---. “Ka Mokupuni a Lopikana Kuluko i Noho ai.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 2 Jan 1862, p. 3.

Kanuha, Kahoʻokahi. Status Update. *Facebook*, 5 Nov 2015, https://www.facebook.com/kahookahi.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty: Land, Sex, and the Colonial Politics of State Nationalism.* Duke U P, 2018.

"Kanuha Found Not Guilty of Obstruction on Mauna Kea." *Big Island Video News*, 8 Jan 2016, http://www.bigislandvideonews.com/2016/01/08/kanuha-found-not-guilty-of-obstruction-on-mauna-kea/.

Kashay, Jennifer Fish. "'O That My Mouth Might Be Opened': Missionaries, Gender, and Language in Early 19th-Century Hawai'i." *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 36, 2002, pp. 41–58.

Ka Ua Haao. "Mr. Lunahooponopono." *Ka Makaainana*, 5 Mar 1894, p. 3.

Kauwahi, J. W. H. *He Kuhikuhi o na Kanaka Hawaii.* H. M. Wini, 1857.

---. "No ka Hoku o ka Pakipika." *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 26 Sep 1861, p. 3.

Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua, Z. P. K. "Ka Olelo Hawaii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* 17 June 1920, p. 3.

Keahi, J. K. "He Opu Keemoa ua puka-a-maka iwaho." *Ka Lahui Hawaii*, 2 Aug 1877, p. 2.

"He Keaka Ano Hou." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 16 Jan 1864, p. 2.

Kelekona, Kahikina. *Ka Puke Moʻolelo o Hon. Iosepa K. Nāwahī*. 1908, Hale Kuamoʻo, 1996.

Kelly, Jennifer Lynn. "Asymmetrical Itineraries: Militarism, Tourism, and Solidarity in Occupied Palestine." *American Quarterly*, vol. 63, no. 3, 2016, pp. 723–741.

Kimura, Larry. *Native Hawaiian Study Commission Minority Report*. U. S. Department of the Interior, Volume I, 1983, pp. 173–203, pp. 214–23.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *The Civil Code of the Hawaiian Islands, Passed in the Year of Our Lord 1859: to which is added An Appendix, containing laws not expressly repealed by the Civil Code; the Session Laws of 1858-9*.1859.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Constitution and laws of His Majesty Kamehameha III*. 1852.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Constitution of His Majesty Kalakaua*.1887.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Journal of the House of Representatives*. 1851–1853.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Journal of the House of Representatives*. 1854.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Journal of the House of Representatives*. 1855–1856.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Journal of the House of Representatives*. 1858–1859.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Journal of the House of Representatives*. 1862.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Na Kanawai o ka Moi Kamehameha V*.1865.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *He Kumukanawai a me ke Kanawai Hooponopono Waiwai no ko Hawaii Nei Pae Aina*. 1839.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *He Kumukanawai a me na Kanawai o ka Moi Kamehameha III*. 1852.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Ke Kumu Kanawai a me na Kanawai o ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. 1841.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Kumukanawahi o ka Moi Kalakaua*. 1887.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Laws of Her Majesty Liliuokalani, Queen of the Hawaiian Islands, Passed by the Legislative Assembly, at Its Session*. 1892.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Laws of His Majesty Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands: passed by the Legislative Assembly, at its session*. 1876.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Laws of His Majesty Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands: passed by the Legislative Assembly, at its session*. 1878.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Laws of His Majesty Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands: passed by the Legislative Assembly, at its session*. 1882.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Laws of His Majesty Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands: passed by the Legislative Assembly, at its session*. 1884.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Laws of His Majesty Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands: passed by the Legislative Assembly, at its session*. 1890.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Laws of His Majesty, Kamehameha V*. 1865.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1845–1846.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1846–1847.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1847–1848.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1848–1849.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1850.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1850–1851.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1851–1852.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1852–1853.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1853–1854.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1854–1855.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1856–1858.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1859–1872.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1873–1875.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1875–1881.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Minutes of the Privy Council*. 1881–1892.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Statute Laws of His Majesty Kamehameha III*. Vol. I., 1846.

Kingdom of Hawaii. *Translation of the Constitution and Laws of the Hawaiian Islands, Established in the Reign of Kamehameha III*. 1842.

Kirch, Adam. “The Other Socrates.” *Barnes and Noble Book Blog,* 7 Sep 2011, https://www.barnesandnoble.com/review/the-other-socrates.

Kirtley, Bacil F. and Esther T. Mookini. “Kepelino’s ‘Hawaiian Collection,’: His ‘Hooiliili Havaii,’ Pepa I, 1858.” *Journal of Hawaiian History*, vol. 11, 1977, pp. 39–68.

Kittelson, David J. *The Hawaiians: An Annotated Bibliography.* U of Hawai‘i P, 1985.

KITV. “Halekala Protestor Speaks Hawaiian in Court.” *Facebook,* 24 Jan 2018, 3:45pm, https://www.facebook.com/KITV4/videos/10155042274251861/.

“Ko ka Oihana no no na Aina e.” *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 18 June 1856, p. 62.

Koha, G. M. “He Ki e Hemo ai na Olelo E a A W. Piliole.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 24 May 1862, p. 3.

Krug, Kalehua. “He Haʻawina ka Moʻolelo, he Moʻolelo ka Haʻawina.” *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Wellbeing*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2016, pp. 101–123.

Kukaulalii. “Kaili Aupuni.” *Ka Ahailono a ka Lahui*, 7 Feb 1890, p. 3.

“Kula Kaikamahine, Wailuku, Maui.” *Ka Nonanona*, 20 Dek 1842, p. 73.

Kulika, Kauka. “He moolelo no ka laha ana o ka olelo a ke Akua, ma na Pae Aina o ka Moana Pasifika. Helu 3.” *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 6 Mar 1861, p. 201.

Kuykendall, Ralph S. *The Hawaiian Kingdom Volume I 1778–1854: Foundation and Transformation.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1965.

---. *The Hawaiian Kingdom Volume II 1854–1874: Twenty Critical Years.* U of Hawaiʻi P, 1953.

Ka Lahui Hawaii, 21 Jan 1875, p. 2.

Ka Lahui Hawaii, 11 Mar 1875, p. 1.

Laimana, John Kalei. *The Phenomenal Rise to Literacy in Hawaiʻi: Hawaiian Society in the Early Nineteenth Century.* 2011, U of Hawaiʻi, MA Thesis.

Lane, J. C., ed. *Directory and Hand-Book of the Kingdom of Hawaii.* The Pacific Press Publishing Company, 1890.

“The Late Hon. G. W. Pilipo.” *Hawaiian Gazette*, 29 Mar, 1887, p. 1.

Lefevere, André. *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context.* Modern Language Association, 1992.

Leib, Amos. *Hawaiian Legends in English: An Annotated Bibliography.* U of Hawaii P, 1979.

Leow, Rachel. *Taming Babel: Language in the Making of Malaysia.* Cambridge U P, 2018.

“The Lightning Detective.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, 3 May 1887, p. 3.

Liliʻuokalani, translator. *The Kumulipo: An Account of the Creation of the World According to Hawaiian Tradition.* Lee and Shepard. 1897.

Liliuokalani. “Ka Buke Moolelo Hawaii i Hakuia e Ka Moiwahine Liliuokalani, ma Wasinetona.” *Ke Aloha Aina*, 2 Apr 1898, p. 3.

---. *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen.* Lee and Shephard, 1898.

Little, Simon. “‘Go Back to Your Country’: Video Captures Angry Exchange on Vancouver Bus.” *GlobalNews.ca*, 24 June 2018, https://globalnews.ca/news/4294198/go-back-to-your-country-video-captures-angry-exchange-on-vancouver-bus/.

“Loeb Classical Library.” *Harvard University Press.* n.d., http://www.hup.harvard.edu/collection.php?cpk=1031.

Loomis, Elisha. Journal 1824-1826. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/82.

Loomis, Ilima. “How the world’s largest solar telescope rose on Maui while nearby protests derailed a larger scope.” *Science*, 1 Aug 2017, http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/08/how-world-s-largest-solar-telescope-rose-maui-while-nearby-protests-derailed-larger.

Lucas, Paul F. Nahoa. “E Ola Mau Kākou I Ka ʻŌlelo Makuahine: Hawaiian Language Policy and the Courts.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 34, 2000, pp. 1–28.

Nā Luna o ʻŌiwi. “Editors’ Note: Kuleana ʻŌiwi.” *ʻŌiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1998, pp. 1–8.

Luomala, Katherine. *Ka Poʻe Kahiko. The People of Old.* Review. *Journal of American Folklore* vol. 79, no. 313, 1966, pp. 501–502.

Lydecker, Robert C. *Roster legislatures of Hawaii, 1841-1918.: Constitutions of monarchy and republic, speeches of sovereign and President.* Hawaiian Gazette, Co., 1918.

Lydgate, J. M. “The Early Missionaries and Primitive Education.” *The Friend*, Apr 1917, pp. 84–85.

Lyon, Jeffrey. “No ka Baibala Hemolele: The Making of the Hawaiian Bible.” *Palapala: A Journal for Hawaiian Language and Literature*, vol. 1., no. 1, 2017, pp. 113–151.

Lyons, Curtis J. “The Song of Kualii of Hawaii, Sandwich Islands.” *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1893, pp. 160–178.

Lyons, Jeffrey K. “Memoirs of Henry Obookiah: A Rhetorical History.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 38, 2004, pp. 35–57.

“He Mahalo ia Uilama Hoonaueueihe.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 19 Jan 1867, p. 2.

“Ka Mahele Olelo o ke Aupuni.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 19 Jan 1867, p. 2.

“Mai Haalele i Kau Olelo Makuahine.” *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, 4 Jan 1906, p. 1.

Maile, David Uahikeaikalei‘ohu. “Precarious Performances: The Thirty Meter Telescope and Settler State Policing of Kānaka Maoli.” *Abolition Journal*, 9 Sep 2018, https://abolitionjournal.org/precarious-performances/.

“Ka Make ana o ka mea Hanohano G. M. Robikana.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 16 Mar 1867, p. 2.

Malo, Davida. *Ka Moolelo Hawai‘i.* Edited by Malcolm Naea Chun, The Folk Press, 2006.

---. *Hawaiian Antiquites*. Translated and edited by Nathaniel Emerson, Bishop Museum P, 1951.

“Maloo na Iwi i ka La.” *Ka Makaainana*, 16 Dec 1895, p. 5.

Marauders_1959. Comment on “Telescope Protestor Found Not Guilty after Trial in Hawaiian.” *Honolulu Star-Advertiser,* 9 Jan 2016, 11:57am, http://www.staradvertiser.com/2016/01/08/breaking-news/telescope-protester-found-not-guilty-after-trial-in-hawaiian/.

Martin, Rachel. “Even Without Interpreter, Hawaiian Judge Brings A Message.” *National Public Radio,* 29 Nov 2015, https://www.npr.org/2015/11/29/457756725/even-without-interpreter-hawaiian-judge-brings-a-message.

Massoud, Mark Fathi. *Law’s Fragile State: Colonial, Authoritarian, and Humanitarian Legacies in Sudan*. Cambridge U P, 2013.

“He Mau Elemakule.” *Ka Lama Hawaii*, 4 Apr 1834, p. 2.

“He Mau Leta Kahiko.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 8 Jan 1864, p. 1.

“He Mau Rula no ke Kakau ana i ka Nupepa.” *Ka Lahui Hawaii*, 14 Dec 1876, p. 3.

maui808films. “Kaleikoa Kaʻeo Speech 01/26/18.” *YouTube,* 27 Jan 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9ie0bPpT7io.

Maui Now. “kaleikoa project part 2b.” *YouTube,* 24 Jan 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UuYXG04W8YA&t.

---. “kaleikoa project part 3.” *YouTube,* 24 Jan 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UuYXG04W8YA&t.

---. “kaleikoa project part 4.” *YouTube,* 24 Jan 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UuYXG04W8YA&t.

McDougall, Brandy Nālani. “Moʻokūʻauhau versus Colonial Entitlement in English Translations of the Kumulipo.” *American Quarterly*, vol. 67, no. 3, 2015, pp. 749–779.

McKean, Jr., Frederick. “British Statutes in American Jurisdictions.” *University of Pennsylvania Law Review and American Law Register*, vol. 78, no. 2, 1929, pp. 195–230.

“Na Mea Hou o Hawaii Nei.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 18 Oct 1862, p. 2.

“Na Mea Hou o Hawaii Nei.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 29 Oct 1864, p. 2.

Medicine, Beatrice. *Learning to be an Anthropologist and Remaining "Native": Selected Writings.* U of Illinois P, 2001.

Merry, Sally Engle. *Colonizing Hawaiʻi: The Cultural Power of Law.* Princeton U P, 2000.

---. “Law and Identity in an American Colony.” *Law and Empire in the Pacific: Fiji and Hawaiʻi.* Edited by Sarry Engle Merry and Donald Lawrence Brenneis, SAR Press, 2004.

Metzger, Bruce M. “Important Early Translations of the Bible.” *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. 150, Jan-Mar 1993, pp. 35–49.

Michelson, Miriam. “Strangling Hands Upon a Nation’s Throat.” *The San Francisco Call*, 30 Sep, 1897, p. 1.

mikethenovice. Comment on “Telescope Protestor Found Not Guilty after Trial in Hawaiian.” *Honolulu Star-Advertiser,* 8 Jan 2016, 3:58pm,

http://www.staradvertiser.com/2016/01/08/breaking-news/telescope-protester-found-not-guilty-after-trial-in-hawaiian/.

Mookini, Esther. *The Hawaiian newspapers*. Topgallant Publishing Co., 1974.

"Ka Moolelo o Beriana ka Wiwo Ole a me Mahone ke Koa." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 21 June 1879, p. 1.

"Ka Moʻolelo o ʻUmi: A Hula Drama, Depicting the Moʻolelo of ʻUmi-a-Līloa." *Hui Mālama i ke Ala ʻŪlili.* n.d., http://www.alaulili.com/umi-a-liloa-mural.html.

Ka Mooolelo Hawaii. Hawaiian Historical Society, 2005.

"Na Mooolelo." *Ka Hae Hawaii,* 9 Feb 1859, p. 178.

Morris, Robert. "Translators, Traitors, and Traducers: Perjuring Hawaiian Same-Sex Texts through Deliberate Mistranslation." *Journal of Homosexuality*, Vol. 51, No. 3, 2006, pp. 225–247.

myauthorizedopinion. Comment on "Rallies across the State Call Attention to Hawaiian Language." *KITV4 Island News,* 26 Jan 2018, 8:08pm, http://www.kitv.com/story /37361814/rallies-across-the-state-call-attention-to-hawaiian-language.

---. Comment on "Rallies across the State Call Attention to Hawaiian Language." *KITV4 Island News,* 28 Jan 2018, 12:24pm, http://www.kitv.com/story/37361814/rallies- across-the-state-call-attention-to-hawaiian-language.

Nabarro, Moanikeʻala. "Arrest Warrant Recalled for Man who Refused to Address Maui Judge in English." *KITV4 Island News*, 25 Jan 2018, http://www.kitv.com/story/37344220/ arrest-warrant-issued-for-man-who-refused-to-address-maui-judge-in-english.

---. "Rallies across the State Call Attention to Hawaiian Language." *KITV4 Island News*, 26 Jan 2018, http://www.kitv.com/story/37361814/rallies-across-the-state-call-attention-to-hawaiian-language.

Nailiili, John. L. "Kue ia ka Hoku o ka Pakipika." *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 3 Oct 1861, p. 2.

Nakoa, Sarah. *Lei Momi o ʻEwa.* Ke Kumu Lama, 1993.

"The New Native Newspaper." *The Polynesian*, 19 Oct 1861, p. 2.

Nichols, Robert. "The Colonialism of Incarceration." *Radical Philosophy Review*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2014, pp. 435–455.

Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 126–140.

"He Ninau." *Ka Hoku Loa*, Sep 1864, p. 35.

Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context.* U of California P, 1992.

"No ka Elepani." *Ka Lama Hawaii,* 14 Feb 1834, p. 3.

"No ka Hoku o ka Pakipika." *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 3 Oct 1861, p. 2.

"No ka Holo a me ka Hikiwawe o na Oihana Ao a na Misionari." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 18 Jan 1868, p. 1.

"No ka Olelo." *Ka Lama Hawaii,* 12 Sep 1834, p. 2.

"No ka unuhi ana i ka Palapala Hemolele iloko o ka Olelo Hawaii." *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 8 July 1857, pp. 57–58.

"No na Kanaka o Polenesia." *Ke Kumu Hawaii,* 10 Dec 1834, p. 21.

"No Loko ae o ka Hae Hawaii." *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 26 Sep 1861, p. 2.

Nogelmeier, Puakea. *Mai Pa'a i ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back.* Bishop Museum Press, 2010.

"Nomination for Representative." *The Polynesian*, 16 Nov 1861, p. 2.

Ka Nonanona, 4 July 1843, p. 5.

"Nu Hou." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 27 Dec 1862, p. 2.

"Ka 'Nupepa Kuokoa.' is published in Honolulu Every Saturday." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 23 May 1868, p. 1.

"The Oahu Evangelical Association." *The Polynesian*, 15 Feb 1862, p. 2.

Office of Native Hawaiian Relations, United States Department of Interior. *Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*. Oct 2015, https://www.doi.gov/hawaiian/reorg.

OHA v. State of Hawai'i. 17-1-1823-11JPC, First Circuit Court of Hawai'i, 2017.

O'Kane, Sean. "Neil deGrasse Tyson: 'The delusion is thinking that SpaceX is going to lead the space frontier.'" *The Verge,* 24 Nov 2015, https://www.theverge.com/2015/11/24/9792854/neil-degrasse-tyson-interview-delusions-of-space-enthusiasts.

"Ka Olelo Makuahine a ka Lahui Hawaii." *Hawaii Holomua,* 12 Apr 1912, p. 25.

"He Olelo no ka Hoonoho i ka Hoohalikeolelo a i Kakauolelo hoi no ke Aupuni." *Ka Nonanona*, 21 June 1842, p. 6.

Oliveira, Katrina-Ann R. Kapā'anaokalāokeola Nākoa. "E Ola Mau ka 'Ōlelo Hawai'i: the Hawaiian Language Revitalization Movement." *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty*, Edited by Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Erin Kahunawai Wright, and Ikaika Hussey, Duke U P, 2014, pp.78–85.

Ortega y Gasset, José. Translated by Elizabeth Gamble Miller. "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*, Edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 49–64.

Ortiz, Simon J., editor. *Speaking for the Generations: Native Writers on Writing.* U of Arizona P, 1997.

Osorio, Jamaica Heolimeleikalani. *(Re)membering 'Upena of Intimacies: A Kanaka Maoli Mo'olelo Beyond Queer Theory.* 2018, U of Hawai'i, PhD Dissertation.

Osorio, Jonathan Kamakawiwo'ole. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887.* U of Hawai'i P, 2002.

---. "'What Kine Hawaiian Are You?': A Mo'olelo about Nationhood, Race, History, and the Contemporary Sovereignty Movement in Hawai'i." *The Contemporary Pacific*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2001, pp. 359–379.

Overbye, Dennis. “Under Hawaii’s Starriest Skies, a Fight Over Sacred Ground.” *New York Times,* 3 Oct. 2016, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/04/science/ hawaii-thirty-meter-telescope-mauna-kea.html.

P minz. Comment on “Rallies across the State Call Attention to Hawaiian Language.” *KITV4 Island News,* 27 Jan 2018, 10:55am, http://www.kitv.com/story/37361814/rallies- across-the-state-call-attention-to-hawaiian-language.

“Na Palapala iwaena o ka Moi Kamehameha III., a me Right Hon. George Paulet.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 2 Aug 1862, p. 4.

Palmer, Julius A. *Again in Hawaii*. Lee and Shepard Publishers, 1895.

“Pauku 4. No ka Aha Kaapuni a me ka Aha Koikoi a me ka Aha Kiekie.” *Ka Elele Hawaii*, 15 June 1848, p. 6.

Perkins, ‘Umi. “The 1840 Hawaiian Kingdom Constitution – one of the world’s first modern constitutions.” *The Umiverse,* 26 Nov. 2016, https://theumiverse.wordpress.com/2016/11/22/the-1840-hawaiian-kingdom-constitution-one-of-the-worlds-first-modern-constitutions/.

---. “On Constitutionalism.” *The Umiverse,* 22 Sep. 2015, https://theumiverse.wordpress.com/2015/09/22/on-constitutionalism/.

Perschon, Mike. “Finding Nemo: Verne’s Antihero As Original Steampunk.” *Steampunk Scholar,* 15 May 2009, http://steampunkscholar.blogspot.com/2009/05/finding-nemo-vernes-antihero-as.html.

Pho, Diana. “#2: The Great Nemo Debate.” *Beyond Victoriana,* 1 Nov 2009, https://beyondvictoriana.com/2009/11/01/beyond-victoriana-2-the-great-nemo-debate/.

Piliole, W. “Ia G. M. Koha.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 3 May 1862, p. 3.

“Poe Haku Manao no ke Kuokoa.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 12 Jan 1867, p. 2.

Poepoe, Joseph. “Ka Moolelo Kaao o Hiiakaikapoliopele.” *Kuokoa Home Rula*, 10 Jan 1908, p. 1.

The Polynesian, 23 Nov 1861, p. 2.

Pratt, Mary Louise. “Lessons for Losing.” *CR: The New Centennial Review*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2016, pp. 245–251.

Pukui, Mary Kawena. “How Legends were Taught.” n.d. HEN I, Bishop Museum, Honolulu: pp. 1602-1606.

Pukui, Mary Kawena and Samuel H. Elbert. *Hawaiian Dictionary: Revised and Enlarged Edition.* U of Hawai‘i P, 1986.

Punimaemae. “E ka Hae Hawaii.” *Ka Hae Hawaii*, Sep 25, 1861, pp. 102–103.

“Rev. I. H. Mahoe.” *Ke Alaula*, Apr 1866, p. 3.

Reynolds, Stephen W. *Journal of Stephen Reynolds.* Edited by Pauline King, Kū Pa‘a Inc., 1989.

Richards, William. “Report to the Sandwich Islands Mission on His First Year in Government Service, 1838-1839.” *Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, vol. 51, 1943, pp. 65–70.

Rosa, John. *Local Story: The Massie-Kahahawai Case and the Culture of History*. U of Hawai‘i P, 2014.

Round, Phillip H. *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663–1880.* U of North Carolina P, 2010.

Ruggles, Nancy. Journal 1819–1820. *Hawaiian Mission Houses Digital Archive*, https://hmha.missionhouses.org/items/show/85.

Sai, Keanu. *The American Occupation Of The Hawaiian Kingdom: Beginning The Transition From Occupied To Restored State.* 2008, U of Hawai‘i, PhD Dissertation.

Schiff, Judith Ann. “Aloha Blue.” *Yale Alumni Magazine*, July/August 2004, http://archives.yalealumnimagazine.com/issues/2004_07/old_yale.html.

Schmitt, Robert C. *Demographic Statistics of Hawaii 1778–1965.* U of Hawai‘i P, 1968.

Schroeder, Janice. “Victorian Education and the Periodical Press.” *Victorian Periodicals Review*, vol. 50, no. 4, 2017, pp. 679–685.

Schütz, Albert J. “Reading between the Lines: A Closer Look at the First Hawaiian Primer (1822).” *Palapala: A Journal for Hawaiian Language and Literature*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1–29.

---. *The Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies.* U of Hawai‘i P, 1994.

Schweizer, Niklaus R. “Kahaunani: ‘Snow White’ in Hawaiian: A Study in Acculturation.” *East Meets West: Homage to Edgar C. Knowlton, Jr.*, Edited by Roger L. Hadlich and J. D. Ellsworth, U of Hawai‘i P, 1988, pp. 283–289.

Semes, Robert Louis. “Hawai‘i’s Holy War: English Bishop Staley, American Congregationalists, and the Hawaiian Monarchs, 1860-1870.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 34, 2000, pp. 113–138.

Shankar, S. *Flesh and Fish Blood: Postcolonialism, Translation, and the Vernacular.* U of California P, 2012.

Shenk, Wilbert R. Introduction. *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2004.

Siddal, John William. *Men of Hawaii: A Biographical Reference Library, Complete and Authentic, of the Men of Note and Substantial Achievement in the Hawaiian Islands.* Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Ltd. 1921.

Silva, Kalena. “The Adoption of Christian Prayer in Native Hawaiian Pule.” *Pacific Studies* , vol. 20, no. 1, 1997, pp. 89–99.

Silva, Noenoe. “The 1897 Petitions Protesting Annexation.” *The Annexation of Hawaii: A Collection of Documents.* 1998, http://libweb.hawaii.edu/digicoll/annexation/petition/pet-intro.php.

---. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism.* Duke U P, 2004.

---. *The Power of the Steel-tipped Pen: Reconstructing Native Hawaiian Intellectual History.* Duke U P, 2018.

Silverman, Jane L. “Imposition of a Western Judicial System in the Hawaiian Monarchy.” *Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 16, 1982, pp. 48–64.

Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States.* Duke U P, 2014.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence.* ARP Books, 2011.

---. “The Misery of Settler Colonialism: Roundtable on Glen Coulthard's Red Skin, White Masks and Audra Simpson's Mohawk Interruptus American Studies Association Annual Meeting.” *Leanne Betasamosake Simpson.* 8 Oct 2015, https://www.leannesimpson.ca/writings/the-misery-of-settler-colonialism-roundtable-on-glen-coulthards-red-skin-white-masks-and-audra-simpsons-mohawk-interruptus.

S. K. K. “Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 26 Sep 1861, p. 4.

Smith, Louise Raitano. Comment on “Rep. Hanohano Prevails in Language Flap.” *KITV4 Island News,* 6 March 2014, http://www.kitv.com/news/hawaii/rep-hanohano-prevails-in-language-flap/24839996#comments.

“Some TMT protesters’ charges to be dropped.” *Hawaii Tribune Herald,* 29 May 2015, https://www.hawaiitribune-herald.com/2015/05/29/hawaii-news/some-tmt-protesters-charges-to-be-dropped/.

Spencer, Thomas P. *Kaua Kuloko ma Honolulu.* Papapai Mahu Press Publishing Co., 1895.

Spivak, Gayatri. “The Politics of Translation.” *The Translation Studies Reader*, Edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 397–416.

---. “Translating into English.” *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, Edited by Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, Princeton U P, 2005, pp. 93–110.

Staley, Thomas Nettleship. *Extracts from a Journal of the Bishop of Honolulu: September to November, 1862*. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1863.

Stark, Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark. “Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land.” *Theory & Event*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2016, n.p.

“State Supreme Court Rules in Favor of Thirty Meter Telescope’s Construction.” *Hawaii News Now*, 30 Oct 2018, https://www.hawaiinewsnow.com/2018/10/30/state-supreme-court-rules-favor-thirty-meter-telescopes-construction/.

State of Hawaii vs Samuel Kaleikoa Kaeo. Order Recalling Bench Warrant, District Court of the Second Circuit, Wailuku Division, State of Hawaii, 25 Jan 2018.

Stewart, Charles Samuel. *Journal of a Residence in the Sandwich Islands, During the Years 1823, 1824, and 1825.* H. Fisher, Son, and Jackson, 1828.

Stockton, Betsey. “Betsy Stockton’s Journal.” *Christian Advocate*, Jan 1825, pp. 36–41.

Tabag, Joshua Ka’mea’lanakila [sic]. Comment on “Rep. Hanohano Prevails in Language Flap.” *KITV4 Island News,* 6 March 2014, http://www.kitv.com/news/hawaii/rep-hanohano-prevails-in-language-flap/24839996#comments.

TallBear, Kim. “Genomic articulations of indigeneity.” *Social Studies of Science* Special Issue: Indigenous Body Parts and Postcolonial Technoscience, vol. 43, no. 4, 2013, pp. 509–533.

Tatar, Maria. *The Hard Facts of the Grimm’s Fairy Tales: Expanded Second Edition*. Princeton U P, 2002.

---. *Secrets Beyond the Door: The Story of Bluebeard and His Wives.* Princeton U P, 2006.

Terrell, Jessica. “Thousands Turn Out for Aloha Aina Unity March.” *Civil Beat*, 9 Aug 2015, https://www.civilbeat.org/2015/08/thousands-turn-out-for-aloha-aina-unity-march/.

Teves, Stephanie Nohelani. “Aloha State Apparatuses.” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 67, no. 3, 2015, pp. 705–726.

Thurston, Lorrin A., ed. *The Fundamental Law of Hawai‘i.* The Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd. 1904.

“Timeline of Mauna Kea legal actions since 2011.” *Kāhea: The Hawaiian Environmental Alliance.* 10 Sep 2016, http://kahea.org/issues/sacred-summits/timeline-of-events.

Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang. “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1–40.

Tymoczko, Maria. “Translation, Resistance, Activism: An Overview.” *Translation, Resistance, Activism,* Edited by Maria Tymoczko, U of Massachusetts P, 2010, pp. 1–22.

---. “The space and Time of Activist Translation.” *Translation, Resistance, Activism*, Edited by Maria Tymoczko, U of Massachusetts P, 2010, pp. 227–254.

“Ua Kapaeia ka Oiaio.” *Ka Makaainana*, 5 Aug 1895, p. 1.

“‘Umi-a-Līloa Mural Project: Pa‘auilo Elementary & Intermediate School.” *Hui Mālama i ke Ala ʻŪlili.* n.d., http://www.alaulili.com/umi-a-liloa-mural.html.

“Unuhi Olelo Paewaewa.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, 20 Feb 1862, p. 2.

Van Dyke, Jon M. *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawai‘i?* U of Hawai‘i P, 2007.

Venuti, Lawrence. “Translation, Simulacra, Resistance.” *Translation Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2008, pp. 18–33.

---. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation.* Routledge, 1995.

Verne, Jules. “He Iwakalua Tausani Legue Malalo o ke Kai.” Translated by G. W. Kanuha, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 18 Dec 1875–30 Mar 1878.

---. *The Mysterious Island.* 1874, Translated by Jordan Stump, The Modern Library, 2004.

---. *Vingt Mille Lieues sous les Mers: Tour du Monde Sous-Marin.* J. Hetzel, 1870.

Visson, Lynn. “Simultaneous Interpretation: Language and Cultural Difference.” *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation.* Edited by Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, Princeton U P, 2005, pp. 51–64.

“Ka Wa ia Kaomi.” *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 11 Sep 1861, p. 94.

Wagner, Sandra E. “Mission and Motivation: The Theology of the Early American Mission in Hawai‘i.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 19, 1985, pp. 62–70.

Walch, David B. “The Historical Development of the Hawaiian Alphabet.” *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vol. 76, no. 3, 1967, pp. 353–66.

Wang, Frances Kai-Hwa. “Hawaiian Language Finds New Prominence in Hawaii’s Courts Decades after Near Disappearance. *NBC News*, 28 Feb 2018, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/hawaiian-language-finds-new-prominence-hawaii-s-courts-decades-after-n851536.

Warner, Lucien. “The Native Race of Hawaii.” *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*, vol. 21, 1904, pp. 26–31.

Wasson, Ellis Archer. “The Whigs and the Press, 1800-50.” *Parliamentary History*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2006, pp. 68–87.

Westervelt, W. D. “The First Twenty Years of Education in the Hawaiian Islands.” *Nineteenth Aunnual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, Paradise of the Pacific Print, 1911, pp. 16–26.

Wiener, Joel H. “The Press and the Working Class, 1815-1840.” *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1971, pp. 1–4.

Williams, Jr., Ronald C. *Claiming Christianity: The Struggle over God and Nation in Hawai‘i: 1880-1900.* 2013. U of Hawai‘i, PhD dissertation.

---. “Race, Power, and the Dilemma of Democracy: Hawai‘i’s First Territorial Legislature, 1901.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 49, 2015, pp. 1–45.

Wolfe, Patrick. “Structure and Event: Settler Colonialism, Time, and the Question of Genocide.” *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, Edited by A. Dirk Moses, Berghahn Books, 2008.

Wood, Houston. *Displacing Natives: The Rhetorical Production of Hawai‘i*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.